

106074

JPRS-UKO-88-005  
19 FEBRUARY 1988



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

***KOMMUNIST***

No 18, December 1987

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19980716 081

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

10  
94  
A05

**Soviet Union**  
**KOMMUNIST**  
No 18, December 1987

JPRS-UKO-88-005

**CONTENTS**

19 FEBRUARY 1988

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Dialectics of New Thinking .....  | 1  |
| Turning to Problems of Real Life [I.G. Grintsov] .....  | 7  |
| KOMMUNIST-Sumy Obkom Meeting on Full Cost Accounting .....  | 12 |
| 'A Time for Specific Deeds and Specific Responsibility' [N.G. Tyurin] .....                       | 25 |
| Entering the New Times [V.G. Bushuyev and N.I. Maslennikov] .....                                 | 34 |
| Revolution Which Changed the Course of History [W. Kashtan] .....                                 | 39 |
| October Revolution and Democracy [G. Farakos] .....   | 43 |
| Juridical Science and Practice Under Conditions of Restructuring .....                            | 47 |
| Ownership in the Socialist Production Relations System [V.Ye. Dementyev and Yu.V. Sukhotin] ..... | 51 |
| Nationwide and State Ownership .....  | 57 |
| Pace of Socialist Building; Thoughts of an Economist [O.R. Latsis] .....                          | 58 |
| Choice of a Road; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting .....  | 67 |
| A Writer's Fate in the Destiny of the Country [V.I. Baranov] .....                                | 76 |
| The Fascination of an Illusion; Monologue of an Actress [O.M. Ostroumovna] .....                  | 83 |
| Soviet Diplomatic Bulletin [Yu. Molchanov] .....  | 86 |
| China on the Path of Reform [F. Burlatskiy] .....   | 87 |
| Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors .....  | 91 |
| Publication Data .....  | 91 |

## KOMMUNIST

No 18, December 1987

[Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents, the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal KOMMUNIST published in Moscow by the "Pravda" publishing house.]

### Dialectics of New Thinking

18020006a Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 3-12

[Text] We are familiar with V.I. Lenin's remark to the effect that each historical stage gives priority to one aspect of Marxism or another. The present turning point in world history and the specific stage of development experienced by our country drastically update creative Marxist-Leninist thinking along the entire front of problems which face man and mankind and which demand innovative and nonstandard approaches to "traditional" as well as essentially new problems which are created today by a fast-changing reality.

To interpret the needs of the age and find qualitatively new solutions in a most crucial situation, when it is a question of the fate of socialism and the future of the world and the individual is the responsibility assumed by the Communist Party. In suggesting specific ways for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world and upgrading the efficiency of the new social system and in heading the practical restructuring of the economic, social and spiritual life, the party formulates and asserts a new way of thinking for our country and the entire world. The shaping of such thinking, which is the only possible one in our age, is a continuing process reflected in the concept of acceleration and restructuring, the course of the April Plenum and the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the documents of the subsequent Central Committee Plenums. M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Goes On," which calls for a decisive rejection of existing dogmas and stereotypes in theory and practice, stimulating the search for new ways in the implementation of the CPSU general line of restructuring and ensuring a lasting peace on earth, is of essential political and theoretical significance. The same trend is followed by thoughts on restructuring, the problems which are facing the country, the scale of change and the characteristics of our time, which were the content of the book by M.S. Gorbachev *"Restructuring and New Thinking for Our Country and the Entire World,"* which was recently published simultaneously in the USSR and the United States and later in other countries.

## I

Necessarily, dialectics includes a profound historicism in our way of thinking. This is an axiom of Marxism. The novelty of the problems which arise cannot be understood and no clear program of action can be formulated

without relying on a serious and substantive analysis of historical experience and without considering the past, the present and the future as a single entity. We consider the present restructuring a specific historical stage in the progress of our society, as a bridge which links the gains of the October Revolution to the country's present and future. In analyzing the past and interpreting our history, we acquire an understanding of the sources of and prerequisites for restructuring, the need for which stems from the profound processes governing the development of our socialist society. From where to where are we crossing on the bridge of restructuring we have built, what do we take with us from the distant and recent past and what "legacy" are we firmly leaving behind? An essentially important concept, consistent with the highest dialectical criteria, to the effect that the way of building a new society consists of a complex series of transitions, was formulated in the report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Goes On." The revolutionary nature of restructuring, undertaken by the party and the people, motivates us to approach the features of socialism as a developing society, a society which develops precisely in accordance with the laws of dialectics, and to consider the basic features of the socialist type of social progress.

The period of revolutionary transformation of a capitalist into a communist society (K. Marx) includes, to borrow the terminology which was developed after Marx, the specifically transitional period from capitalism to socialism and socialism as a whole, which is the entire first phase of the communist social system. Both Marx and Lenin drew the attention to the **transition, transitional state**, inherent in the **entire period** preceding the building of communism, considering this period precisely as a systematic chain of transitions, changes in transitional forms, etc. We see in this the direct indication of the approaching developed socialist society in a strictly dialectical manner, and a consideration of each one of its stages as a specific transition, identifying in its characteristics the specifically transitional features with their inherent contradictions.

Restructuring is a natural link in this transition from capitalism to communism, which spans over a huge period of time, even on a historical scale, marking the beginning of a new stage in developing socialism, and the beginning of the transition of socialism to a qualitatively new condition, from extensive to intensive development. Restructuring means a directed process of establishing a new quality in our society, the need for which has been realized and which is being deliberately directed. It is a necessary social form of developing socialism, called upon to ensure its faster progress.

"Restructuring," notes M.S. Gorbachev in his book, "is a revolutionary process, for it is a leap in the development of socialism and the implementation of its essential features. We realized from the very beginning that there is no time for hesitation. It is very important not to 'linger' too long at the starting line, to surmount the

lagging, to come out of the mire of conservatism and to break the inertia of stagnation. This cannot be accomplished in an evolutionary manner, with timid, gradual reform" (p 48). Steps of a revolutionary nature are necessary in order to come out of crisis or pre-crisis situations against which even socialist society is not ensured. The most important thing, the author proves, is that socialism is capable of undertaking revolutionary changes, for it is dynamic in its nature.

The revolutionary, the transitional nature of the present forces us to approach on the basis of the new thinking problems of the **dialectics of the methods** of building and developing our society. The live contradiction of the progress of socialism, the variety of accumulating problems, the combination, the "coexistence" of obsolete with new and developing ways and means of work and the accumulation of "fragments of the past" and of "shoots of the new" (Lenin) constitute a reality which demands a thorough and profoundly scientific study.

M.S. Gorbachev, who makes a close study of the pioneering path of socialism in our country, indicates the objective foundation for the complex decisions which were made in the 1920s and 1930s and also mentions that the ways and means of implementing the changes were not consistent with socialist principles in everything and at all times. It is also a fact that the "ways and means of socialist building, forced by circumstances reflecting the specific historical conditions in our country, were canonized and idealized and elevated to the rank of general immutable dogmas. The result was an impoverished, a schematized aspect of socialism, with an inflated centralized management and underestimation of the variety and wealth of interest of the people and their active role in social life, as well as clearly reflected equalization trends" (p 42).

The need for new approaches and a new thinking increased both in theory and practice—economic, political and ideological-theoretical. Here is a very recent example: raised on the ideas that the quantitative growth of output had priority, we tried to hold back the declining pace but acted primarily through the old methods of additional outlays, by increasing output in the fuel-energy sectors, accelerating the economic use of ever new natural resources and so on, thereby worsening the faults of extensive economic development. Now we must make a sharp turn in our very method of thinking, in the approach to the solution of pressing sociopolitical and economic problems. That is why, as the author notes, from the very beginning of restructuring, the party has ascribed prime significance to the conceptual approach. "Naturally," he adds, "we also tried to reduce the size of the chaos in the methods. In order to achieve something substantial it is by no means mandatory to begin by turning everything upside-down and only then to correct errors" (p 46).

What are the methods and ways of movement toward a new qualitative condition of society that must become leading? In the light of Marxist-Leninist theory and the

new way of thinking (which is "new" not only from the chronological viewpoint but also because it traces its roots in the methodology of scientific communism) "plan or market," "justice or efficiency," "discipline or democracy," and so on, are false dilemmas which are still extant in the social consciousness. The entire content of the book proves that we need neither "pure," doctrinary, far-fetched socialism, ideal in the abstract, or an escape beyond the boundaries of a socialist choice. We seek answers to the questions raised by life within the framework of the actually existing socialist system and gauge all of our successes and errors with a socialist yardstick. "Those who hope that we shall turn away from the socialist way will be bitterly disappointed," the author says. "Our entire program for restructuring as a whole as well as its individual components are entirely based on the principle of more socialism and more democracy" (p 32).

A tremendous variety of ways and means of action, which must be used without looking every minute at the scourge of "undermining the foundations," exists and is developing within the framework of the socialist social system, on the broadest possible foundations of socialist principles. As we see in the practice of restructuring the features of a transitional state, such as the simultaneous effect of the old and new economic mechanisms and the complex processes of mastering the standards of democracy, as well as the difficult psychological break which parallels changes in customary priorities, such phenomena cannot be considered something abnormal and we should not be frightened by our own shadow. Today, when our society is economically and politically strong, we should not fear one error or another, which would be difficult to avoid in such a tremendous undertaking. It is important to identify and eliminate such errors promptly and draw proper lessons for the future. We must firmly stand on the grounds of real life, guided by the interests of the working people and of socialism. The party sees in this a loyalty to Leninism and the continuation of the cause initiated with the October Revolution.

A problem which has repeatedly been put on the agenda of our history, that of the pace of progress, is also being solved in accordance with the realities of life. After the victory of the October Revolution, in order to protect its gains it was necessary to build, and to build rapidly, the industrial aspect of the country out of domestic sources and to limit consumption by accelerating industrialization. Today the tasks of restructuring must be solved at a faster pace, leading the country out of stagnation, and reaching new levels in scientific and technical progress. However, both then, in the 1920s and the 1930s, and today, accurately determining the extent of acceleration, and rapid advance while avoiding the losses caused by a hasty skipping of necessary development stages, remained and remains an immutable requirement. "...Conservatism and artificial vanguardism, however different their rhetoric may be, in the final account, at the end, inevitably blend within each other. Such is the dialectics of politics," noted M.S. Gorbachev at the



CPSU Central Committee Conference on Problems of Party Work. "They merge on the grounds of violating reality, for they try to push it into various dead-end streets: the former into obsolete forms and dogmas, and the latter into abstract plans, dangerous in terms of demagogic aggressiveness and barrenness of illusions."

One of the principles of true Leninist revolutionism is not to play at "revolutionary phraseology," and not to be carried away, fuss or abuse administrative methods in order to bring the target "closer," and to outstrip time itself. The characteristic feature and strength of restructuring lies in the fact that it is a revolution both "from above" and "from below." Here firm political will, resolve, daring and, at the same time, sensitive reacting to the processes occurring within the people, the ability, in Lenin's words, to reach "into the level of consciousness and the decision of the majority of the popular masses and the level of their own experience" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 207) are important and necessary. The art of politics is precisely the ability to combine these aspects of a dialectical contradiction. Both historical experience and modern practice offer many reasons for optimism in this case. "Life clearly confirms that at sharp turns in history, in a revolutionary situation, the people show an amazing ability to listen, understand and respond if told the truth," the author emphasizes. "Even during the most difficult times after the October Revolution and during the civil war, that is precisely the way Lenin acted. He went to the working people and openly spoke with them. That is why it is so important for restructuring to maintain the high tone of the political and labor energy of the masses" (pp 54-55). This, however, is possible only on the basis of democratization and glasnost, developing and strengthening the democratic, the popular foundations of socialism.

Heaps of routine concepts are cleared within the framework of the democratic process. Psychological stereotypes, which sunk roots in the course of long periods of time and which not even the harshest decrees could eliminate, are becoming a thing of the past. Mastery of the standards of democracy and turning the observance of democratic standards and principles into a habit are the most important prerequisites in shaping and using the new way of thinking. A new understanding of democratic centralism is asserted in the course of restructuring. The author notes the importance of observing the proper interconnection between its two aspects, bearing in mind that at different stages emphasis should shift to the necessary one. This applies to the complex problems of reforming the economic mechanism, in the course of which a new understanding of centralism is asserted, which has nothing in common with the bureaucratic regulation of many-sided economic life. It is necessary to democratize planning and to separate more accurately and purposefully the functions of the center from those of the local areas, and to change the nature of the work of sectorial management authorities. Democratization is developing on all levels, in all social cells, and affects

every individual. Restructuring needs a higher level of organization of society, the conscious discipline of the citizens and their ability fully to exercise of their rights and, consequently, the enhancement of the individual and the stronger and more comprehensive combination of personal interests with socialism.

The author emphasizes the prime importance of a creative attitude toward theory. The development of restructuring and the new thinking depend on the enhancement of the theoretical standards of all ideological activities, qualitative improvements in the content and functioning of the human consciousness as a whole and its conversion into an efficient factor for stimulating the changes occurring in the country. All the creative forces of the party and society must become involved in such work. The tasks here are broad: we must fully revive the Leninist concept of socialism, ensure a qualitative growth of our true legacy, theoretically interpret developing processes, promptly determine the critical points in the development of contradictions and solve the latter skillfully. The author particular cautions against the ossification of the creative thinking of the party and the dogmatizing of revolutionary science, for this would deal a mortal blow at restructuring and at overall social progress.

In an article which accompanies the publication of excerpts from M.S. Gorbachev's book, the American journal U.S. NEW AND WORLD REPORT (9 November 1987, p 81) notes: "Russia's progress will depend on many factors but, above all, on an element which could be highly constructive or destructive—leadership. In his book Gorbachev shows that he is well aware of the challenge of the time. He also proves that his confidence in the outcome of the initiated changes is justified." Western interest in events in our country is tremendous. We do not conceal that we wish to be understood, for an accurate understanding of restructuring is a key to understanding the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the changes in international relations resulting from the new political thinking, aimed at creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world and asserting civilized principles in intercourse among nations and countries.

## II

The task of formulating ways for the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development and ensuring success in restructuring Soviet society is most closely and most clearly related to the need for a sober and realistic assessment of the fluctuating state of affairs in the world and the demand for a profound theoretical interpretation of its development in the immediate and the distant future. In this case, as the CPSU notes, we must not only free ourselves from customary concepts which belong to a past age but also help other nations, the entire global community, to realize the realities of the contemporary world. The growing interest throughout the planet in the ideas and course of restructuring in the USSR helps the dissemination of the new political thinking which is

increasingly penetrating the consciousness of broad social circles, drawing the attention of soberly-thinking political leaders and becoming a real force in international relations, as was indicated, in particular, at the meeting of representatives of parties and movements which participated in the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and laid the beginning of a wide dialogue among international leftist forces, above all for the sake of eliminating the threat of war and solving other major universal problems.

The new political thinking is a philosophy for shaping a safe world in the nuclear space age. It is developing along with the objective processes in the world. The Soviet Union has gone a long way since the April plenum in interpreting the new situation and the possibility of changing it for the better.

M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Goes On" and his book (in the section entitled "New Thinking and Peace," which describes the way in which the CPSU conceives of the contemporary world and the conclusions which it draws in terms of practical policy and what the Soviet people expect of the world community, contain a comprehensive Marxist-Leninist analysis of the problems of global development and the further elaboration of the concept of a new political thinking.

The conclusion based on the author's consideration of the problems which surround mankind is simple: restructuring is needed by a world saturated with nuclear weapons, a world beset by serious economic and ecological problems, in which there is poverty, backwardness and disease; restructuring is needed by mankind, which is urgently facing today the need to ensure its survival.

Is such restructuring possible? The Soviet Union unreservedly asserts and comprehensively substantiates its possibility. Furthermore, it substantiatedly proves that no other way is possible if we proceed from true concern for the future of civilization. Based on the conclusions of the April Central Committee Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress, the author brings to light the concept of an interrelated, interdependent, contradictory yet extensively integral world of today. As he metaphorically says, today the peoples of the world "are like the rope connecting mountain climbers on a slope. They could jointly advance toward the peak or else together fall into the precipice" (pp 142-143). The conclusion is that political leaders must rise above narrowly conceived interests and realize the entire drama of the contemporary situation. That is why the question of the need for a new interpretation of the entire international situation and all of its constituent factors is so pressing.

In our age problems of international and national security and social development are closely interdependent. This interconnection, which is manifested largely in a new fashion which, one could say, is knocking at the door of today's world politics, has now been given a deeper substantiation.

As the author notes, there is no rigid cause and effect link between war and revolution. The Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence among different social systems is acquiring a new, a more comprehensive content. The new facets of its content shed light on the characteristics of the nuclear age, the establishment of an integral world despite its variety and contradictoriness, and the aggravation of the global problems which challenge man's biological ability to survive. The implementation of Lenin's idea of peaceful coexistence has become now a prerequisite for the continuing existence of the human species, expressing a universal interest in saving civilization from catastrophe.

Therefore, it is no longer a question of the struggle among opposing social forces in the international arena. "Economic, political and ideological competition between capitalist and socialist countries is inevitable. However, it could and should be kept within the limits of peaceful rivalry, which mandatorily presumes cooperation. It is history which must judge of the merits of one system or another. History will decide everything. Let each nation decide which ideology and system is better. Let this be decided by peaceful competition and let each system prove its ability to meet the interests and needs of man" (pp 151-152).

Hence the requirement of granting each nation the right to choose its own path of social development, forsaking interference in the domestic affairs of other countries and showing respect for other societies, combined with an objective and self-critical view on one's own. Ideological differences should not be taken to the area of intergovernmental relations and foreign policy should not be subordinated to them, for ideologies may be on opposite poles but the interest of survival and the prevention of war is universal and supreme. The new thinking in this matter is based on thoughts on the priority of the interests of mankind, expressed by V.I. Lenin himself and which, today, have acquired special meaning and significance. Actually, could anything be considered more important than the task of preventing a nuclear catastrophe?

Nothing can eliminate the significance of a class-oriented approach, for this is the basis of Marxism. The class struggle was and remains the pivot of social development in societies divided into classes. Nonetheless, the appearance of mass destruction weapons has put an objective limit to class confrontation in the international arena. This, understandably, does not mean that the class analysis of the reason for the nuclear threat created by militaristic circles in the ruling class of the leading capitalist countries should be abandoned. Nor does it mean an acknowledgment of any kind of convergence on the part of different social systems or the intention of converting everyone to the Marxist credo.

"The logic of the social dynamics of the age," the CPSU Central Committee general secretary noted at the Moscow meeting of representatives of parties and movements, "is becoming increasingly apparent. Its essence is

the material and spiritual self-discrediting of the exploiting society." However, this logic does not eliminate the legitimate concern caused by the unchanging nature of imperialism in which the main military threat is to be found. Life has formulated for the Soviet Union and for all peace-loving and progressive forces difficult problems and their answers will determine the development of historical events in the next decade. In short, it is a question of whether capitalism will be able to adapt itself to the conditions of a nuclear-free and disarmed world, a just economic order and the conditions for an honest comparison between the spiritual values of the two worlds.

It is entirely clear that it is life that will provide the definitive answers to questions related to the possibility of blocking at the current stage in the development of the world the most dangerous manifestations of the nature of imperialism and to limit the range of the destructive effect of egocentric and narrow-class interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie. At the same time, the accuracy and feasibility of the program for a nuclear-free and safe world, formulated by the Soviet Union, will be tested not only through the impeccable nature of its scientific substantiation but also by the course of events subject to the influence of a great variety of new forces. Here as well the Soviet Union acts precisely in accordance with the Leninist tradition and the very essence of Leninism: the requirement of approaching theory as a tool of practice and practice as the control mechanism in testing the accuracy of theory.

The existence of three large groups of countries in the contemporary world, each one of which with its own interest, determines the specific nature of the overall view of international relations today, together with a foreign policy strategy aimed at the preservation and consolidation of peace. In the postwar decades socialism developed into a major factor of world politics. The cause of global progress and the struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe are inseparably linked to the strengthening of its positions. In the long term, it is precisely socialism, in our conviction, that will make a decisive contribution to the elimination of the critical points which have developed in the development of civilization. Today socialism has reached the stage of profound study and comprehensive reforms and broader and more efficient cooperation. The process of internationalization of restructuring, which is increasingly understood as an objective law, is gathering strength.

The greatest reality of the contemporary world is the fact that a large group of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have taken the path of autonomous and independent development, has emerged in the international arena. The nonaligned movement, which includes the participation of more than 100 countries and which accounts for a tremendous share of the population on earth, has become the embodiment of the aspiration of liberated nations for the safeguard of universal peace, equal cooperation and the exclusion of manifestations of

domination and diktat from international life. The problems of the developing countries are related to pressing social problems and regional conflicts triggered by local reasons and the efforts of the West to consider, as in the past, such countries as spheres of its influence. One of the most important problems here is to secure for all nations the right to choose their own path of development and to handle their own fate and resources in conditions of peace and stability.

A great deal—above all the possibility of solving the problems of the contemporary world and freeing development possibilities—depends on the views held by the United States and the West as a whole, which are facing today a decisive choice: if relations are to be structured on the basis of equality and a consideration of everyone's interests, why is a military machine, which was created in the past as a weapon for an expansionistic foreign policy, needed? A flight into the past will not answer the challenge of the future but will mean the display of an adventurism based on fear and lack of self-confidence. The United States can and must use its power, its capital, and anything which is now being turned to military use in solving the economic and social problems of our time. The other Western countries could become involved in this as well.

The Soviet leadership has repeatedly confirmed its decisive rejection of positions according to which the conduct of international affairs and national security are conceived exclusively in terms of reliance on nuclear weapons. It is entirely clear that in a world of nuclear weapons any effort to use them to solve one problem or another, including problems which exist between the USSR and the United States, would be suicidal. "Furthermore, today a truly paradoxical situation has developed. Even if one side keeps rearming itself and increasing its armaments while the other does nothing, the side which is arming itself would not profit, as it were, from this. The weak side could simply explode all of its nuclear charges, even on its own territory. This would mean suicide for it and a slow killing of the enemy. That is why the aspiration to gain military superiority is the pursuit of a myth. It cannot be used in realpolitik" (p 230).

Such is the initial premise on which the program for the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the 20th century, formulated in the 15 January 1986 statement of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, is based and such are the major compromise suggestions formulated on its basis at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. A major stage in the implementation of this program was the drafting of the historically first treaty between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of an entire group of all medium- and shorter-range nuclear armaments. The Soviet leadership is striving to achieve tangible results in the area of making deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons under the conditions of a strict observance of the ABM treaty, which is of basic significance in maintaining strategic stability.

The idea of creating a comprehensive system of international security under the conditions of disarmament was drafted and presented at the 27th CPSU Congress on the basis of approaches essentially different from those of the past. It was presented to the entire world, to governments, parties, social organizations and movements which are truly concerned with the fate of peace on earth. The Soviet Union considers security a comprehensive concept which includes not only military-political but also economic, ecological and humanitarian aspects.

The new thinking in foreign policy, as well as the course of corresponding restructuring in international relations trace their origins to the principles formulated by V.I. Lenin. "In proclaiming our support of honest and open policy, we have in mind honesty, decency and sincerity and are following these principles in practical terms," the author states. "In themselves, such principles are not new. We inherited them from Lenin. The new feature is that we are trying to free them from the ambiguities which have become so widespread in the contemporary world. Another new fact is that the current situation makes them mandatory for everyone" (p 163).

The parts in the speech by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary which deal with international affairs, his books and his speeches at meetings are imbued with the belief that the political thinking suggested by the Soviet Union, born of the realities of our time, will make its way and become the principle which will guide relations among countries and nations.

Increasingly, the new style of political thinking is penetrating life on the planet and is being acknowledged. It demands the shaping of political thinking and political action strictly in accordance with changed socioeconomic, scientific and technical, ecological, military, sociopsychological and humanitarian-cultural realities to which the contemporary age has ascribed an essentially new level of complexity.

Decades ago, V.I. Vernadskiy, our great compatriot, reached a general conclusion on the planetary scale of the conscious activities of man, subsequently described as the noosphere, i.e., the environment in which the mind operates. His is a strongly binding definition! A mind which is truly scientific and which has an accurate understanding and consideration of reality is needed not only by scientists and not only by all participants in material production but, above all, by politicians and the political structures they represent—parties, countries and their agencies, and international organizations. The new type of political thinking which is asserting itself must be imbued with the ideas of reason. Based, above all, on the most progressive conceptual outlook and the achievements of modern scientific knowledge, it is truly dialectical. Dialectical materialism provides an accurate theoretical foundation for the interpretation of the rapidly changing situation in the world and the study of

contradictions which determine the content of complex and closely interwoven and intertwined processes occurring in contemporary history.

The new political thinking demands of us to analyze all essential problems and contradictions not only when they threaten us with unpredictable upheavals but steadily, without taking time off, for universal history itself has no "breaks."

The new political thinking is asserting its profoundly dialectical nature by the fact that it is **initiative-minded**. The existence of unsolved problems and the appearance of new ones urge the harnessing of the entire intellectual potential of politics in order to make a thorough and comprehensive study of the vast set of contradictions on which such problems are based, to formulate a forecast for future developments and to seek and find possibilities of their practical solution.

New political thinking is distinguished by high **practicality**. It presumes taking immediate constructive action to solve any problem the moment its nature becomes clear and the opportunities and conditions for its resolution become obvious, so that any progress in interpreting problems is paralleled by a fresh political solution and an innovative practical step.

By its very nature the new political thinking is **constructive**, i.e., it is **self-critical and realistic**. It proceeds from the consideration of the interests not of a single subject of politics but also of those which oppose it, and the broadest possible scope of the interests of all confronting or interacting sides. We believe that the importance of this in the contemporary situation, fraught with the threat of a military conflict which could destroy everything, is self-evident.

The mastery of a new political thinking is the best antidote to the penetration of elements of dogmatism and sectarianism in the theory, ideology and politics of the communists, as well as to the erosion of the principles of scientific socialism: ideological weakness, presented as flexibility. In this sense as well today we can confidently say that yes, our road leads to the Temple, to the shining Temple standing on a green hill. This is not a symbol of religious humility. We are marching toward a lofty humane objective, desired by generations of philosophers and working people who dreamed of the high and just forms of organization of society. In the course of difficult struggles of restructuring, our social system is becoming renovated and man is acquiring a new quality. This is the main thing, for the sake of which it is worth living, thinking and working.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### Turning to Problems of Real Life

18020006b Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18,  
Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 13-20

[Article by Ivan Grigoryevich Grintsov, first secretary  
Sumy Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee conference, which was held at the end of November, stipulated as the topical tasks of party work ensuring the two main trends in the second stage of restructuring—the democratization of all social life and radical economic reform. At that conference, M.S. Gorbachev expressed the very important idea that “it is necessary for each party committee to open itself up, so that the people may regard this party agency as their own home and go to it with their joys and concerns.” Once again the conference reminded all of us that the meaning of restructuring in party work, as was repeatedly mentioned in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and the CPSU Central Committee Plenums, is to achieve a decisive turn to the people, to real life.

I drew up a special list in my notebook of addresses and names of people whose views and actions advanced my own thinking and made me abandon previous views or, conversely, asserted the accuracy of a viewpoint.

Nikolay Sergeyevich Bezuglyy is chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Michurin, Lebedinskiy Rayon. He is an agronomist by training. He was a Komsomol member until very recently. He is respected by the people for good reason. When the young specialist took over the kolkhoz, the latter was in debt to the amount of 1,672,000 rubles. The farm undertook to grow vegetables on a contractual basis. Consideration of the needs of consumers turned into profit for the kolkhoz. Eighteen months later, the farm had in its account 1.2 million rubles. A truly good job had been done.

It is said that a caring owner will always find opportunities. The chairman's colleagues stubbornly refused to hire graduates belonging to a group of decorative flower-growers trained at the rayon SPTU. They wanted milkmaids. Naturally, milkmaids are needed. However, Nikolay Sergeyevich went to the rayon center personally to invite five masters of greenhouse farming. He welcomed them as precious guests and provided them with housing. The farm built a greenhouse. The very next year it showed a profit of 100,000 rubles. However, this was not merely a matter of money. One of the flower-growers got married, her first-born will soon enter kindergarten and, later, secondary school which, like the kindergarten has already been built in the kolkhoz. It is thus that the people settle on the land...

Nikolay Bezuglyy and those like him are sober and thrifty managers who realized in the past the results of the oblast's short-sighted policy of indiscriminately classifying numerous villages and towns as “futureless.” The true masters of the land convincingly proved and are still

proving that another policy was more promising: even the smallest farmstead is worthy of attention, and even if inhabited by a single family.

Occasionally one comes across managers who seem to be bursting with energy, who say the proper things, who urge the people on and attend one conference after another but are unable to coordinate the work. No harmony exists where no close cooperation between private and social interests has been attained in the thinking and acting of the people. Incidentally, the statements of the participants in the roundtable meeting on problems of applying the principles of full cost accounting at industrial enterprises, which was held recently in Sumy at the Machine Building Scientific-Production Association imeni M.V. Frunze, were in the same spirit.

Cases of the striking changes which occur when the concept of “my” is accompanied by that of “our” and, conversely, of stagnation and marking time, when such interests do not coincide, are so obvious and numerous that the ranks of the supporters of the former should be swelling while those of their opponents, should be visibly diminishing. Alas, so far such is not the case....

According to scientific data, the resource potential per hectare of farmland in the Sumy area averages 5,430 rubles. The average for the past 5-year period, however, has been no more than 1,042 rubles, or 19 percent of possible results. The contrast in yields per such real and not “computed” hectare is striking! It is as though this land is not located within a single oblast but scattered throughout the world! Naturally, the land could and indeed does vary even within the territory of a single farm. However, one of the reasons for economic success or failure of a labor collective is permanent and applies equally to the north and the south, and to rich and poor soils: it is the attitude of the people toward the work and their ability to organize it.

For many long years Kosovshchinskiy Sovkhoz, near Sumy, tolerated annual losses in vegetable growing averaging 60,000 to 70,000 rubles; for example, the turnip crop averaged no more than 36 quintals per hectare. Then, however, the sovkhoz's administration and its party organization undertook to apply the family and brigade contracting system. Today more than two-thirds of the land is farmed here on the basis of this technology. As a result, the turnip crop immediately rose to 253 quintals per hectare and labor productivity improved by a factor of 12. The farm has now become used to an annual profit of 500,000 rubles.

We tried to disseminate more extensively the experience of Kosovshchinskiy Sovkhoz. The results were felt by all Sumy people. Not so long ago, even onions had to be shipped into the city from the southern parts of the country. The justification was that in our area it does not ripen properly. Today not even a mention is being made of this excuse and the surrounding farms are fully

supplying the oblast's urban population with vegetables. Therefore, the problem is not that of land fertility alone but also of the approach to the work.

The prerequisites for the enhancement of what we call the human factor, developed with the help of the radical economic reform and the democratization process, cannot be applied automatically. Furthermore, we cannot fail to see that to a certain extent restructuring is becoming more stressful. This too has its fully explainable logic. Yes, it would be unlikely for economic initiative, inherent in that same Nikolay Bezuglyy, which is promoting restructuring, to make him break the law today, as had happened to his colleagues. It would be naive to hope, however, that any daring initiative which disturbs the routine of a customary way of life and the established order of things would be welcomed enthusiastically by a bureaucrat or a philistine who represents the forces which embody the mechanism of obstruction which is by no means dismantled entirely. Its effect, as has been noted, is selective: it strikes most heavily at those who are most intolerant of stagnation, who are daring in their enterprise and persistent and initiative-minded in achieving a specifically social rather than personal objective.

These people are the "gold stock" of restructuring. The most important duty of the party committees is to care for them, to protect them from various types of encroachments, including defamations, which are so zealously pursued with anonymous letters, and to create for all fighters for restructuring the "most favored regime" in their work.

Obviously, every worker must be doing his own work and there must be a clear demarcation among the functions of party, soviet and economic authorities. However, I am convinced that it is impossible to list most precisely the details of party work and to say that this is purely a party function and that over there is "foreign territory."

In recent years, in addition to vast residential districts, several quite large public projects, which have embellished the city, have appeared in Sumy: a children's town, the "Romantika" Palace for young people, a theater, and an enclosed market. They were built essentially with the funds and forces of enterprises. The city soviet played a role in coordinating their efforts. However, frankly speaking, could all that have been possible in a period marked by all sorts of restrictions, without the energy, persistence and efficiency displayed at that time by the party gorkom and, particularly, its first secretary Mikhail Afanasyevich Lushpa? What numerous skirmishes he had with enterprise directors and ministry personnel! But what was this? Was it substituting for the local soviets? Or else was it interested help for the sake of a common cause?

I believe that stagnation is greatly helped precisely by the type of party workers who have become accustomed to and aim at acting "here and there," without breaking the

circle of customary duties, sanctified by long tradition. Such people do not hasten to intervene and help but refer, in justification, to the spirit of the time, quoting the inadmissibility of "taking over." Such activists should be replaced, the sooner the better.... The entire point is how to deal with economic problems, in what way and through what means and on the basis of what concepts and for the sake of what end objectives in providing party economic guidance.

When we see today party workers who, sincerely concerned with the socioeconomic development of an enterprise or rayon, try to use obsolete methods, resorting to the notorious "priming" of cadres and engaging in petty supervision, the first thought that comes to mind is that this is not exclusively their fault but is frequently also a difficulty caused by the inability to master efficiently and profoundly the new approaches to party work. For who are, in their significant majority, our cadre and party workers and members of the elected party aktiv? They are yesterday's economic managers, engineers, and specialists in various public production areas. This system of training party cadres was largely justified. The trouble is only that many of them bring into party work by no means the best means of management they have mastered in production work which, furthermore, is hardly based on the latest achievements of contemporary management science, greatly emphasizing the technocratic approach to the solution of socioeconomic problems and failing to master their social dimension, so to say.

Many of them are simply incapable of acting differently. Frequently we teach our cadres, who, as a rule, feel confident in technical matters, the elements of party work "in general," hoping that they are somewhat familiar with social disciplines, having studied them in the VUZ. Such knowledge, however, turns out to be clearly inadequate today.

Currently 25 oblast enterprises are working on the basis of cost accounting and self-financing. Although the results they show vary, their overall contribution to industrial output in the Sumy area is high: 42 percent. As a whole, this year 205 oblast enterprises had profits totaling some 510 million rubles, including 50 million above the planned figure. This may seem adequate. However, we must not fail to see that 20 percent of such profits and a significant share of above-plan profits (66 percent) were the results of the efforts of that same Scientific-Production Association imeni Frunze, for which it should be praised. But why then has the large detachment of big and small enterprises—the foundation of the oblast's economic potential—fallen so far behind the vanguard?

The first and most visible explanation is that not all of them work as hard as they should. Until recently this was our basic premise in assessing the results of the activities

of the collectives of lagging enterprises: we sought the reasons in the organizational and educational work of the party committee. We tried to ignore the fact that the excesses of the now dismantled economic mechanism frequently encouraged collectives to violate lofty and precious moral values for the sake of the plan and the "prosaic nature" of daily production life. However, this is not the full explanation....

As we think of the prime reason for the successes achieved by leading labor collectives in restructuring, we inevitably realize that the change occurred whenever the labor collective, its party organization and the management opposed slovenliness and confusion. For example, for more than 2 years any violation of labor and social discipline at the Khimprom Association has been strictly condemned. This act, which applies above all to party members, especially managers, was initiated by the plant's party organization, which gained support in waging the struggle for maintaining labor and behavioral discipline among the workers, including nonparty members. Public departments of cadres, prevention councils and comrade courts were set up and are actively at work at the enterprise. The enterprise has a "Regulation on Collective Moral and Material Responsibility for the State of Labor Discipline and Public Order," signed by 87 percent of all shifts, brigades and sections. Absenteeism and working time losses here have declined by 70 percent. The enterprise is steadily overfulfilling its plan and was among the first to convert to self-financing.

Contemporary "Oblomovism," which clearly disagrees with socialism, rarely appears as a form of idling. On the surface, it frequently seems to be even active. It is betrayed, I would say, by the "obsolescence," the "traditional style" of thinking in solving the new problems raised by life, and the sluggishness and routine in practical actions.

Until recently Semen Grigoryevich Kandyba was chairman of the Chervonny Prapor Kolkhoz Sumy Rayon. An experienced manager and good organizer, he anticipated the difficulty: his native Basovka Village was becoming depopulated. The reason was clear: the people did not wish to live a poor life, without public baths, a good school, a post office and a store. But who could build all this? The solution was "consolidation," the chairman quickly decided. "We must merge with the neighboring large farm which has plenty of people. This is what is done everywhere else." However, the party organization and the kolkhoz veterans were of a different opinion. "This is a false solution," they argued with the chairman. "Naturally, we would achieve something but we would forsake our own future: the further social development of the consolidated farm will be naturally centered around the main farmstead and all we would get would be the crumbs. And the people here, in Basovka, would also like to live like human beings...."

To the credit of the chairman, for the sake of the good of the project, he was able to swallow his pride and acknowledge that the people were right. The kolkhoz

party members were actively supported by the Sumskiy Party Raykom. The process of reviving the village was started internally. People came to Basovka having realized the changes in the social organization of life and the possibilities which this opened. All that we can add is that today Chervonny Prapor is headed by former party organizer Aleksey Dmitriyevich Chernenko, who replaced Semen Grigoryevich Kandyba after the latter took another job.

What the party expects of each one of us today is to make sure that our specific work sector become an active participant in restructuring, not in words but in action. There always is such a sector where you, and you alone, are responsible for the state of affairs. This seems to be extremely clear. But let us be honest: restructuring is precisely and largely hindered by the fact that many of us lack a clear idea about our own place in the revolutionary changes, and precise knowledge as to how specifically to do the work.

What, for example, does fitter Ivanov think about his personal possibility of helping the enterprise increase its profits? What is, from the viewpoint of welder Sidorov, working at the assembly shop, his own role in enhancing the social development of the collective? Could it be that knowledge of this is not all that important? Work in their sector and shift may be well organized and the workers will keep their word by conscientiously fulfilling their production assignment. Such concepts are most likely guiding today the organizers of political and economic training who discuss with students, who have come to the class after a hard day's work, the convertibility of working capital and the question of capital returns, totally unrelated to the ordinary realities of the production process to which such concepts are closely tied. What happens in such a case? If the situation is assessed on a party and principle-minded basis, it means alienating the working person from conscious and, therefore, active participation in restructuring and in the management of enterprise affairs.

Under the new economic management conditions the party committees (they, above all) face the vital task of teaching the people the "abc of restructuring," and of helping every party and nonparty member to find his own place in it sooner. Let me repeat that using the words self-support and self-financing as an incantation is not enough! We must organize universal economic training in such a way that these and other vitally important concepts in terms of restructuring assume a specific meaning for everyone, whether a worker, a design engineer, an economist or a party official.

It is precisely the practical experience of the party organization at the Association imeni Frunze that has proved the possibility of solving this problem. Here every worker knows how to "split the ruble," what part of it will go to the budget or the fund for the social development of the collective, and what will go into the wage fund. Such a specific knowledge is stronger than



even the most striking words and thunderous slogans, helping every working person truly to feel his own social importance and extent of his real influence on the affairs of his collective. The knowledgeable solution of socio-economic and engineering and technical problems related to production intensification must be headed ex-officio by the leading cadres and specialists at the enterprises, associations and departments. Are they ready for this? Not always and everywhere by any means.

Frequently directors, chief engineers, technologists, chiefs of shops and the personnel of plant economic services have a very superficial idea of the way they will be working in the immediate future under conditions of full cost accounting and self-financing. There is nothing astonishing in this, considering that in the oblast's industry one-third of all economists and one-half of all bookkeepers lack specialized training. For example, at the Lebedin Plastic Accessories Factory, until the party obkom recently interfered, the positions of senior engineer-economist, labor and wages engineer and chief of production and procurement departments were held, respectively, by an agronomist, an educator with secondary training and a chemistry teacher. No one can benefit from such "consistency."

In this sense, the situation with the oblast agroprom is no better. Last year 44 farms worked at a loss. Practical experience convincingly demands the soonest possible use of family contracting, a shop production structure, control of outlays through the checkbook, and extensive development of specialization and interkolkhoz cooperation. Instead, oblast agroprom specialists continue to issue orders to farm managers and technologists and to "issue" them control figures. Nor are some party committees "falling behind" in their support of the administrative-command style of management. Both last and this year personnel of the Krolevetskiy Raykom paid 58 visits to the Vpered Kolkhoz and 69 to the Progress Sovkhoz. This may have seemed suitable, for both farms are among the laggards. The actual results of such attention which, I have no doubt, was dictated by the zealous aspiration of the raykom personnel to change the situation, did not change for the better. Not in the least! Both farms were and still are working at a loss.

I do not think that such striking examples of shortcomings in the political and professional training of cadres, their low-level of competence and degree of readiness for change I have deliberately chosen are characteristic exclusively of our Sumy Oblast. In all likelihood, similar cases can be easily found among our close and more distant neighbors. Naturally, this is bound to worry us.

Glasnost and democratization shed light and put in the foreground so many interesting people who are knowledgeable and full of ideas and who are literally thirsting for action, that the possibility of seeking and choosing

the necessary personnel in party and other social organizations and labor collectives is virtually unlimited. The use to which they are put is the main question and a rather difficult one at that.

For example, this year nearly 80 percent of the top managers and chiefs of shops, foremen, and brigade leaders in the oblast's industry were elected. What more could one wish? Naturally, this indicator could be raised to the 100 percent level. However, such haste would be totally unwarranted. A study of the results of the "elections" (I have deliberately put this word in quotes) made it clear that they had been largely reduced to the mere procedure of voting. The qualities and shortcomings of no more than one out of three of the leading officials and of one out of two of medium-level managers had been discussed in advance and "sifted" through public opinion without which, you would agree, elections become a bare formality. The same situation prevails in agricultural production. The model statute of kolkhozes clearly demands that managers, starting with the chairman, be elected. Nonetheless, in our kolkhozes slightly more than one-half of brigade leaders and team leaders were subject to a "vote," and no single candidacy was rejected.

Formalism is the opposite of culture, whether political or any other, and the worst enemy of live action. It is particularly dangerous in the area of sociomoral and sociopolitical relations. In the development of democracy, in the words of V.I. Lenin, formalism turns extremely easily into mockery. What makes this even more dangerous is that in this kind of democracy all external requirements of glasnost seem to be strictly observed: the meetings are open to the public and the slate of candidates has been, so to say, "worked out" (occasionally it even becomes a "competition" as to whose slate would be longer), and anyone has the right to speak. However, sometimes there is nothing to be said: the people are unfamiliar with the candidates and are unable to find anything about them during the meeting, and the organizers have not always considered such problems in advance. This makes such elections nothing but a sham....

By promoting contemporary forms of labor organization—brigade and collective contract—and by systematically asserting the principles of cost accounting in the economy and converting enterprises and associations to self-support and self-financing, we thus truly increase the interest of the working people in the end results of their labor and therefore in how is this labor to be organized and by whom. The party committees as well should take into consideration this increased interest in implementing their cadre policy.

For a number of years the situation at the Motordetal Plant in Konotop was bad: the production plan remained unfulfilled, the percentage of rejects was excessively high and production standards had reached their lowest level. In an effort to correct the situation, the Konotop Party Gorkom applied the worn-out system of



replacing the enterprise directors one after another and appointing outsiders. Not the least among the reasons of such a "cadre leap-frogging" was the desire to avoid responsibility for the state of affairs in the collective and the old formalism of claiming that steps had been taken, a new manager had been appointed, and that should solve the problem.

However, in accordance with the requirements of restructuring, the gorkom decided to consult with the labor collective before appointing a new director. The advice was unanimous: make Chief Engineer N.V. Siver plant director. Eighteen months later the enterprise was unrecognizable: without any visible strain the collective began to cope with the plan and with contractual procurements (both in terms of time and variety); the quality of output improved 100 percent.

But how was it possible to increase the output of finished goods in an industrial facility by 18 to 20 percent without increasing the equipment or the number of workers? The labor collective council at the plant solved this problem quite simply: the foremen of the individual production sectors were organized in brigades and their wages were linked to the end work results of shifts and shops. The foremen began earning up to 300 rubles, which was twice the previous amount. Initially, many people worried about the wage situation. The council, supported by the party organization, firmly pursued its plan. When the annual results were summed up, it became clear that these same foremen had made a very substantial addition not only to their own but also to the total plant budget: a 20 percent increase in the volume of finished goods, which made it possible substantially to upgrade the material incentive and social development funds of the entire collective.

Today everyone at the plant can clearly see the expediency of this new system. Initially, however, it was opposed by many. There were resentment and complaints, claims that foremen were nagging and demanding too much. This demanded the active and aggressive stance of the party organization in opposing such backward feelings. A great deal of effort was demanded of the party group activists and party buro members to convince the doubters and to expose to the honest workers the true face of the bawlers who were not concerned with the true interests of the labor collective which, in the final account, always benefits from instilling order and discipline in production.

As we may see, no miracle whatsoever occurred in this case. It was simply that Nikolay Vasilyevich was the type of party member-manager who, without any superficial actions or loud appeals and tiring moralizing can rally the people and provide them with the necessary moral, organizational and economic facilities for the main thing, i.e., for their work. Priority was assigned to improving the working and living conditions of the people.

What was particularly important was that the party organization itself began to act in an entirely different manner with the new director who did not resort to administrative ways. It became much more active and initiative-minded. Not astonishingly, all the tried forms of party work, such as party meetings and reports submitted by party members were concentrated on specific matters and dealt with things which were of interest to and understood by the people.

This story, with its favorable outcome, is noteworthy for one circumstance which, in my view, is quite essential. A great deal of time was lost until we, party workers and senior economic managers, were able to notice and properly assess Siver. Yet one could and should have promoted this talented organizer to the position of managing an enterprise to which he had dedicated many years of his life, sooner. Alas, this did not take place....

Everything seems to indicate that what we need today is an organized system for the search, selection and promotion of talented people who can become the acknowledged informal leaders of restructuring. Noteworthy data have been acquired as a result of a sociological survey sponsored by the obkom at the start of this year. More than 26,000 working people expressed their views about their leaders. The situation appears to be more or less favorable in the case of the strictly professional qualities of managers, such as the level of their competence, specialized knowledge and experience. In this area more than 80 percent of the respondents gave a positive assessment to said qualities. Assessments concerning the merits of managers as educators were entirely different. About 20 percent of those surveyed said that their leaders are simply not educators. What was the basis of this conclusion? What was the specific reason for mentioning it more frequently than other features? It was the attitude toward criticism. Less than one-half of the participants in the survey believed that their superiors properly react to criticism; one-third noted a formalistic attitude toward criticism or simply the use of open pressure to suppress efforts at expressing honest views concerning the leadership. More than 20 percent of those surveyed pointed out the lack of standards and the rudeness of their managers. These are depressing data. However, we find encouraging the exigency of the people, which is strengthening in the course of the process of democratization and glasnost in public life, and their intolerance of any acts detrimental to human dignity. Let me also add that the study of this investigation revealed a noteworthy and powerful pattern which may seem strange only on the surface: the production process suffers wherever the manager does not stand out by his cultural standards and high moral qualities.

A raykom party secretary toured the fields and saw that the sowing of sugar beets had not started although the raykom had instructed otherwise. The young members of the brigade, the first in the farm to convert to a collective contracting system, tried to explain to the secretary the reasons for the delay: the soil was still too

cold. The answer was the following: "Scandalous! Inadmissible! The raykom stipulation must be implemented tomorrow! You must report personally to me!" Well, the instruction was implemented, the seed was planted in the soil which was unready. As ordered, a report was filed. In the autumn, however, they averaged 180 quintals where 350 were possible. The moral harm which this type of leadership brings is self-evident. The party obkom saw to it that this example of thoughtless bureaucratic administration was properly assessed by the public in all units of the oblast party organization and labor collectives without exception.

Unfortunately, to this day the case we cited is no rarity, although it is absolutely alien to the spirit of restructuring. To this day efforts at bureaucratic administration on the part of the leaders of party committees on different levels and party apparatus personnel may still be found, although not to such extremes. To this day the command tone of voice and arrogant admonitions which are not based on knowledge of specific circumstances, as well as insulting familiarity, which is a sign of rudeness, in the attitude toward rank-and-file party and nonparty members may still be encountered.

Our moral guidelines and party ethics criteria are precise. They have been tested through the hard experience of the party and codified in the CPSU statutes. Nonetheless, speaking honestly, are we still not tolerant of various violations of party ethics and standards of socialist community life? The explanation is always ready: restructuring, it is claimed, is a time of excessive stress, and the inevitably related struggles and passions. Let us ignore feelings, the cause comes above all. However, the moral cleansing of the party and moral renovation of socialism are also matters of extreme importance. The further development and intensification of democracy are vitally necessary to the party and society at large. This was clearly stated at the November CPSU Central Committee Conference.

It is not only the firm conviction of the relevance of precisely this formulation of problems of restructuring of party work under the new conditions, as demanded by the CPSU Central Committee, that have led me to discuss the ethical, the moral side of restructuring, but also my personal experience in a brief "betrayal" of principles which are dear to me. My stubborn memory does not allow me to forget events which occurred 12 years ago. I had just taken up my duties as first obkom secretary. I wanted immediately to achieve a great deal, and sharply to turn the situation in the oblast around. I thought that in order to achieve this good objective it would be no sin to apply pressure and, for the sake of the project, even hurt someone's self-esteem. In short, at my first plenum I lashed out against one of the farm managers, accusing him of omissions which, as it became clear later, he had not committed....

This memory is painful but cannot be erased. What happened, happened. Yet it did not have to happen!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### **KOMMUNIST-Sumy Obkom Meeting on Full Cost Accounting**

*18020006c Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 21-33*

[Roundtable meeting between the journal KOMMUNIST and the Sumy Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party, at the Sumy Machine Building Scientific-Production Association imeni M.V. Frunze]

[Text]A significant number of industrial associations and enterprises are already working on a self-financing basis. Starting with 1988, the enterprises and associations of another 20 industrial ministries and other economic sectors will convert to the same system.

Currently there is tremendous interest in the specific experience in such work by enterprises operating on the basis of full cost accounting. The economists realize that today this is not as yet full cost accounting but merely "fuller cost accounting," the fullest possible within the individual large enterprise without changes in the most important socioeconomic mechanism, such as price setting, planning and procurements.

In the next few years, while the old economic mechanism will yield to the new in the course of a struggle waged day after day, the new style of economic thinking will begin to be asserted comprehensively and many new problems will have to be solved. That is why it is precisely now that it is so important to interpret already acquired experience and to identify the "underwater reefs," the imperfections of the applied cost accounting system, which are painfully affecting the economic life of pioneering enterprises.

These questions were discussed at a roundtable meeting jointly sponsored by the editors of KOMMUNIST and the Sumy Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party, which was held on 18-19 September 1987 at the Sumy NPO imeni M.V. Frunze. Participants included the personnel of more than 50 enterprises, establishments and organizations in the oblast, representatives of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and central economic departments, economic institutes, and personnel of the journals KOMMUNIST UKRAINY (Kiev) and VOPROSY EKONOMIKI (Moscow).

KOMMUNIST journal editors Ye. Gaydar, V. Ivanovskiy and V. Yaroshenko prepared the roundtable materials for publication.

## Nature of the Experiment

**V.P. Moskalenko**, deputy general director, Sumy Machine Building Scientific-Production Association imeni M.V. Frunze:

For a long time we have worked on the use of economic methods at the association. Gradually, starting with the mid-1970s, we have been introducing our system which has now become popular in the country.

For the past 15 years our plans have never been amended (lowered); the association has fulfilled its planned assignments for basic indicators ahead of schedule and ensured high rates of economic development. During that time the volume of output averaged a 50 percent increase and profits rose by a factor of 2.5 per 5-year period.

Nonetheless, our system for internal cost accounting clashed with the existing economic mechanism. We tried to interest the internal economic production units to adopt stressed plans and to identify all available efficiency reserves. However, bearing in mind the system of financial allotments which prevailed in the national economy, as a whole such a policy was by no means always advantageous to us. The additional profits we earned by increasing the efficiency with which we used resources were mostly appropriated by the state budget and the ministry. We never knew in advance what share of the profits would be withheld and what would remain at our disposal.

In short, the idea of the experiment which was undertaken by the enterprise in 1985 was very simple and indicated by life itself. We were issued long-term (5-year) fixed ratios for the distribution of profits among the state budget, the centralized ministry fund and the enterprise. We knew that 70 kopeks per ruble of additional profit will remain at our disposal. In the past such a definite knowledge was entirely lacking.

Understandably, since at that time our enterprise was the only labor collective in the sector to adopt the new system, the standards issued for us could be only custom-made. However, even this was considered a temporary decision. When all sectorial associations and enterprises converted to the new financing conditions as of 1987, we abandoned the customized standard, thus losing part of the withholdings from profits for our own economic incentive funds.

The conditions under which our association was converted to self-financing were roughly similar to those in the other sectors. We too converted to the new system under harsh conditions: the 5-year plan which had been approved and issued to the associations. However, we did not wish to make the experiment suit the plan or the plan suit the experiment. From the very beginning, the experiment was based on the idea of earning one's own funds, i.e., on self-financing.

Relations between enterprises and superior authorities are based on standards. The principles on which they rest will determine whether or not self-financing will become reality or fiction, and whether or not the enterprises would obtain the possibility for independent economic management or will be doomed to plugging gaps.

Objectively, it is obvious that the problem of formulating a supporting system of standards is complex, for each includes high- average- and low-profit enterprises and enterprises which are simply losing, with an obsolete technical base, which cannot exist without outside help. What to do with them?

If we start from scratch, for example, by building 10 identical enterprises, they could all be given issued identical rates for withholdings for the budget and the ministry and for their own cost accounting funds. In reality, however, enterprises developed under the conditions of the redistribution of funds. Some became richer at the expense of others which, in turn, fell behind because their entire net profit was appropriated by other entities.

Our ministry has plants whose basic capital is more than 60 percent worn out, as well as new plants in which wear and tear is under 20 percent. It is impossible to order all of them to start work at the same time. The starting times should either be different or else starting conditions should be equalized, taking into consideration that some enterprises are stronger than others.

The Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, which faced such difficulties in 1986 in preparing associations and enterprises in the sector for converting to self-financing, took the path of developing a uniform system for taxation of enterprise profits.

It began by determining the rates of withholdings for the budget, differentiated in accordance with production profitability (the more profitable a given production facility, the higher the share of profit which the enterprise must set aside for the state). This made it possible to place labor collectives under relatively equal conditions. Enterprises with identical profitability set aside for the budget an identical share of their profit.

Naturally, the profit distribution mechanism which was developed in our ministry on the basis of rating scales is not the peak of perfection. Furthermore, we are confident that these are merely the initial steps. The main idea, however, has been understood by everyone: we must live on what we earn and, if we are short of funds, borrow and repay.

The same approach was known to the other ministries as well but they preferred to use their own system, which was approximately as follows: the financial plan for the 5-year period was formulated on the basis of the approved plan. Enterprises short of centralized capital investments were given funds to finance them. This was

described as the standard. Enterprises which were not scheduled to receive capital investments had their funds appropriated. Essentially, it was the old economic mechanism that was being reproduced within the stipulations of the economic reform.

I believe that the reason for this approach is simple: the aspiration of ministry personnel to apply customary methods they understood and, furthermore, to retain their real economic power over enterprises.

For if an enterprise would have 80 percent of its profit taken away and only 20 percent left for the development of its production facilities and sociocultural and material incentive funds, the collective would not show any real interest in efficient work. Conversely, it would start dreaming of a return to the old economic mechanism.

Today, however, more than one-half of the profits of enterprises in the machine building complex remains at the disposal of the producers themselves. Is it not possible, having such funds, to develop an efficient economic incentive mechanism?

Let me reemphasize that we do not consider that the Ministry of Chemical Machine Building has developed an ideal system. We have currently drafted new proposals on profit distribution: we suggest, depending on profitability, a differentiation in the taxation of the base profit while its increase, which depends to a greater extent on the efforts of the labor collective, to be distributed on the basis of a single rate applicable to all enterprises. There may be better ways. But where are the suggestions of the authorities which should organize such work and make use of the scientific potential and the experience acquired as a result of practical economic management? For the time being, the single approach which enjoys the real support of economic departments and ministries is to make everything fit the plan. This is simpler and better for everyone but the enterprises. In our sector they are the final recipients. They have no one to whom to pass on groundless decisions which they themselves must implement. If successful, they would be able to reduce to a minimum the harm caused to the project, the enterprise and the collective.

The result is that our colleagues visit the shops of their enterprises, where they blush, pale and are unable to provide any cogent explanation, for how could such a thing be explained?

To us the main problem of the 13th 5-Year Plan is the price-setting reform. It is clear that self-financing can survive only on the basis of prices which take into consideration the consumer value (usefulness) of the output. It is the price reform alone that will enable us to introduce identical payment rates for productive capital and other resources. Under these circumstances all the profit left at the disposal of the enterprises should be distributed by the labor collective itself. Unquestionably, rates must be set for economically substantiated limits of

wage increases, the more so since a way to achieve this does exist, i.e., control over the correlation between wage increases and labor productivity.

We are waiting for a radical restructuring in planning and procurements. The Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will become effective as of 1 January 1988. The enterprise will be given a legal foundation for true autonomy. We are as yet to realize the tremendous responsibility which will be assumed by collectives, enterprise managements and party committees under such circumstances.

We must learn how to plan and ensure procurements and financing ourselves. Nonetheless, both the law and the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum resolution offer a general plan for restructuring and, if one may say so, we need the details, we need blueprints. For the time being, they are not all that good and resemble the parts of another, older written-off machine tool.

#### Purity of the Experiment

**V.P. Loginov**, deputy director, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics:

What role did external favorable factors play in ensuring the successful work of the Sumy NPO, including the fact that it was given a low withholding rate from its profits for the budget?

**V.P. Moskalenko.** Let us compare its situation with that of the VAZ which converted to the new economic management conditions at the same time as the Sumy NPO. It is true that the conditions under which the experiment was conducted at these two enterprises differed substantially. The VAZ did not undertake to finance production expansion. In Sumy the entire expansion of output was financed by the enterprise. For that reason budget withholding rates were different: the Volga plant surrendered 50 percent of its profits, compared to no more than 30 percent by the Sumy NPO. Had we received budget funds for new construction related to expanding the production process, naturally, we would have withheld a higher percentage for the budget.

The situation now has changed. It is no longer the case of an experimental enterprise. All enterprises in the sector have been converted to self-financing. At the Minkhim-mash profits are distributed on the basis of a single rate for all sectorial enterprises. We could have maintained our special status, for our rate was set for the 5-year period. However, we did not do so. Why?

The fact is that for many years we proposed and supported the idea of universal taxation of profits and we simply could not allow ourselves to hold on to special benefits. The collective deliberately accepted the higher withholding rate. Today we withhold 47 percent for the state and keep 53 percent for ourselves.

This year's enterprise profit will be 25 percent higher and withholdings for economic incentive funds will be reduced by 15 percent. This is not paradoxical. We are withholding for the state as much (in percentage) as the other sectorial enterprises whose production profitability matches ours.

**P.G. Bunich**, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member:

I have visited the Sumy association frequently and I think that I am familiar with that enterprise. It was referred to here, at the roundtable meeting, as a "special enterprise." I have frequently heard this term used. This reference is such as to make its experience extraneous, implying that the enterprise operates under special conditions. Therefore, there is no point of considering it. But let us look at those special conditions. A great deal is being said about imported equipment. Most of the enterprise's equipment was not imported. There are a number of plants which are entirely equipped with the latest imported equipment and which are using it extremely inefficiently.

My assumption is that the Sumy people themselves contributed to the appearance of this legend. The disease of ostentation is widespread in our country. In this case as well it was not avoided. Guests are taken to see the best shops equipped with the most advanced equipment, ignoring backward and obsolete production facilities which are a heavy burden on the association's economy. The result is that the guests leave convinced that the enterprise is in an ideal situation.

#### Self-Financing in the Sector

**V.A. Reznichenko**, deputy minister, USSR Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building:

It would be premature to draw conclusions on the results of the conversion of the sector to self-financing. However, it can be said that economic work as a whole has improved and allowed many labor collectives to fulfill their profit plans and increase their cost accounting funds. However, there have been enterprises in which the economic incentive funds were reduced by 15 to 20 percent and one enterprise was left without any such funds. The new aspect in this situation is that they should not expect any help from the ministry. They themselves must take the necessary steps. Possibilities exist. For example, as a result of harnessing internal resources, in 6 months the need for enterprise working capital in the sector declined from 67 to 14 million rubles. Production costs are being reduced faster than in machine building as a whole. In the first 8 months of 1987, with a certain increase in the volume of output, employment decreased by 2,700 people. In short, it can be said that the plants in this sector have begun to master the new economic management mechanism.

However, as practical experience indicates, many managers have still poorly mastered economic management methods. Decade after decade the enterprises had become so greatly accustomed to beg from the state all they needed that in frequent cases they were simply unable and unwilling to "earn a living." One of the very first and clear lessons of the experiment was that it exposed the poor economic training of enterprise managers. As a rule, they are more or less familiar with technology and equipment. However, the strict language of economics remains, in their case, a deeply sealed secret.

**S.D. Yurchenko**, chief of administration, USSR Promstroybank:

The introduction of self-financing at the Minkhimmash, as in many other sectors, was complicated by the fact that it took place under the conditions of the traditional economic mechanism. For that reason, so far the sector has been unable to achieve the expected results. The reason for this should be sought beyond the limits of the mechanism of self-financing itself and need a special study.

However, encouraging changes have been noted in a number of areas. For example, since the beginning of the year the number of requests for new equipment within the Minkhimmash system has increased by 30 percent and the plan for production updating was fulfilled. The assignment issued by the GKNT in mastering the new type of output was fulfilled. This had never occurred in the past.

We are beginning to get a feel of the new mechanisms for stimulating the process of innovation. It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of our accomplishments.

**V.G. Starodubrovskiy**, deputy director, International Scientific Research Institute of Management Problems:

It was accurately said here that we should not expect self-financing to bring about quick changes in the economy, for it is not a magic wand. The time has come to abandon any kind of impatient childish faith in all sorts of magic. What is needed is long, patient and courageous work. But how do we describe in the press, for the benefit of the broad public, the question of self-financing? We write that the Sumy Association has converted to self-financing and now just look at the results! We do not mention, however, that this success is the result of many years of economic work. In other words, we ourselves are promoting unjustified illusions.

#### Rates and Incentives

**K.M. Cherkasova**, chief economist, USSR Ministry of Finance:

What concerns us at the Ministry of Finance is the following: when rates are issued for sectorial enterprises, efforts are made to set high withholding rates for the budget for enterprises which work unsatisfactorily and are economically weak and to accumulate centralized ministry funds at the expense of the strong enterprises (which show high profitability and profit). And everyone curses the Ministry of Finance. A kind of childish game is being played, for the Ministry of Finance is, above all, watching over the interests of the state, the interest of the country's budget.

**V.P. Moskalenko:** It is above all you, the personnel of the Ministry of Finance, who are to be blamed for such actions, for it is precisely the Ministry of Finance, which must protect the national interests, that has adopted the method of setting the rates which are issued to the sectors. Can you not understand that a most important matter such as self-financing should not be left to the sectorial ministries to handle! The country must have a single methodology of standards for profit distribution, understandable and substantiated. Is finding such a system not the most important task of the Ministry of Finance and the other economic departments?

We have improperly organized the restructuring of the economic mechanism. Structural systems which have been properly developed technologically should be used in economics. We must formulate economic systems which are much more complex than ever before, for they affect the vital interests of millions of people and contain conflicting interests and aspirations. But what is happening? With incredible light-heartedness everything is being concentrated on individual rates, despite the absurdity of the action, for a rate should be a universal category rather than an individualized one. Setting individual rates is the equivalent of allowing individual automotive combines to set up their own road traffic rules.

**A.V. Siginevich,** head of sector, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics:

Today the central economic authorities are accusing ministries and enterprises of having set up poor rates although the formulation of a methodology is a most important task of these agencies.

**Retort:** Just the central authorities and not the science of economics?

**A.V. Siginevich:** Yes, the economic institutes were officially instructed to submit reports on methodological developments based on the specific conditions of the ministries, i.e., to draft their profit distribution rates.

Such data were prepared by the Central Economic-Mathematical Institute, the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics and other economic scientific institutions. To the best of my knowledge, the materials were not seriously considered. The question is, why?

**O.M. Yun,** department deputy chief, USSR Gosplan:

The main difficulty in setting the rates was the need to proceed from the approved ratios within the 5-year plan as the firm reality. It was indeed true that the rates were based on the plan and were not an instrument in its formulation. However, this is merely half the difficulty, for in this case as well resources must be produced rather than received automatically. It is bad when specific rates are set arbitrarily, on the basis of computations. The best variant of all those so far developed (this is universally acknowledged) is the one used by the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building. Essentially, it involves the taxation of profits, which is also required by the Law on the State Enterprise. Other sectors as well have tried to apply this approach but tremendous disparities in profitability levels, substantially greater than at the Minkhimmash, have made this impossible.

**V.P. Moskalenko:** Could it be that all 20 ministries which will be converting to self-financing starting with 1 January 1988 have such a high disparity in profitability that uniform rates cannot be applied? We studied this question and believe that such is not the case.

Oleg Mikhaylovich, could you personally express your view as an official of the Gosplan as well as a scientist: Why, nonetheless, is it that most sectors did not apply the clearly sensible principle of uniform profit taxation?

**O.M. Yun:** Unquestionably, I support this approach, which is simple and understandable. Furthermore, I believe that the profit taxation rate should be uniform for all machine building sectors. Actually, it is difficult to explain why the profit earned by Minkhimmash enterprises should be distributed on the basis of some principles and those of, shall we say, the Ministry of Agricultural and Tractor Machine Building, on the basis other. They operate under similar economic conditions and, naturally, should apply identical self-financing principles.

Many sectors could apply the taxation method in the distribution of profits. Honestly speaking, the pressure applied by the sectorial ministries discouraged this. No particular skill is required to add up all incentive funds stipulated in the 5-year plan, add to them planned capital investments and correlate this amount with profits, thus obtaining a rate figure. However, in order to develop a uniform substantiated procedure for profit taxation tremendous analytical work is required. Nonetheless, as acknowledged by everyone, a conversion to a tax system will be the way of the future.

Individual rates do not harm anyone's interest or offer anyone advantages. They simply translate the ratios included in the 5-year plan into the language of cost accounting. Any other profit distribution system would change enterprise working conditions compared to previously established ones.

Whatever we may say about the shortcomings of the rates which have been issued, now the actual dynamics of profitability will be directly determined by the economic situation of the enterprise. Hardly any manager here present could honestly say that his enterprise cannot increase its profitability by drawing on internal reserves.

**A.D. Bondarenko**, secretary, Sumy Obkom, Ukrainian Communist Party:

Some of our national sectors are the base of the economy. Specifically, this applies to the construction materials industry, metallurgy, the coal industry and the power industry. If we wait for the construction materials industry to "self-develop," we shall be unable to provide every single family with an apartment by the year 2000.

**O.M. Yun:** The tasks of strengthening the foundations of the economy are being solved and will continue to be solved on the basis of the national interests, including also through centralized accumulations. To this effect we must also use the mechanism of state orders. This mechanism could stipulate radical reconstruction and expansion of enterprises the lagging of which is hindering national economic progress. It is important, however, also to make use of the significant reserves for upgrading efficiency, which exists in the base sectors. It is precisely this that we would like to achieve above all in converting the enterprises in the base sectors to full cost accounting.

**V.A. Krasko**, chief of the planning-economic department, Sumy Porcelain Plant:

Why was light industry harmed in the distribution of profits? Is its situation any better and could it boast of supermodern equipment and brilliantly developed socio-cultural life? Henceforth our enterprise must withhold 62 percent of its profit for the budget and 17 percent for the centralized ministry fund. So little is left to it that however hard we may be working our situation cannot improve. We cannot retool the production process, for which reason we shall be behind the leading sectors. In my view, this is a manifestation of the obsolete underestimating of light industry.

**O.M. Yun:** I repeat that the rates were computed on the basis of the approved 5-year plan. They include the resources which you were scheduled to receive in the course of the 5-year period.

In simple terms, the correlation between these resources and your profits is somewhat different from that of other sectors. This includes also the fact that the percentage of profit included in the price of light industry goods is higher compared with other sectors. Your question refers not to rates but to investment policy for the 12th 5-year period.

**N.S. Gerasimchuk**, deputy director, UkSSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics:

In my view, it would be expedient in the future to set only the rates of payments from profits to the state budget in terms of property and income tax, and to the local budget as payment for natural and labor resources. The remainder of the profit, the amount of which depends on the efficiency of economic management, and all amortization withholdings should be left at the disposal of the enterprise.

**P.G. Bunich:** I do not consider the system of enterprise income distribution as applied by the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building ideal. I shall discuss one aspect only: so far, here as well taking away from the enterprises amortization withholdings has not been standardized. The ministry could collect more amortization withholdings from one enterprise than from another. Uniform distribution principles have not as yet been extended to this area. I agree that it would be expedient to abandon altogether the taking of amortization funds from enterprises. The redistribution of such funds is a natural function of the banks. In order to establish an economic mechanism which is totally oriented toward efficiency several more steps must be taken within the system currently used by Minkhimmash. The main problem is, however, that so far we have still not been able to see to it that such a major step taken by Minkhimmash as converting to the taxation of profit is duplicated in other sectors.

**K.M. Cherkasova:** Let me say something about the profit tax. The question is currently being considered and such taxation will be applied during the 13th 5-year period, when conditions for it will have been created.

**P.G. Bunich:** Does this mean, if I understand you accurately, that for the next 3 years there will be no taxing of profit? What about the law on the enterprise which, I hope, you have read? It clearly stipulates that such taxation will start as of 1 January 1988.

**K.M. Cherkasova:** This will be accomplished gradually. All capital investments for the present 5-year period have already been allocated. Furthermore, a number of theoretical problems arise in this area. At present the profitability of enterprises varies. Its quick standardization is impossible. We must begin by equalizing the enterprises' economic and production potential.

**P.G. Bunich:** Do you truly believe that the production potential of enterprises throughout the country can be equalized in 3 years? Furthermore, is this necessary? If we wish to link national economic management with cost accounting we could accomplish it today; if we do not, it will never be done, for 3 years hence, the next 5-year period will prove to be quite important as well.... Or else do we need for the application of cost accounting to wait for a "unimportant" 5-year period?!

**A.M. Belyakov**, deputy chief of administration, USSR Gossnab:



Generally speaking, I believe that if nothing can be changed in the 5-year plan the reform could be discredited. We must set priorities. For example, it is an open secret that the commodities which are urgently needed by consumers account for the lesser part of the metal produced in the country. The production of individual types of metal goods could be reduced not only without harming but even to the benefit of the national economy. We must not allow ourselves once again to be stupefied by tons and rubles.

**A.Sh. Akhmeduyev**, head of sector, USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics:

In my view, the indicators of the 12th 5-Year Plan should be considered as control figures of a nonmandatory nature. Only thus can we avoid a conflict with the Law on the State Enterprise.

**V.G. Starodubrovskiy**: I see no major obstacle to linking the system of profit taxation, based on uniform principles, to the tasks of the current 5-year period. I believe that the whole problem is the conservatism displayed in financial planning and departmental barriers inside the pocket of the state. I am confident that the solution lies in drastically upgrading the role of investment credit. If we develop surplus financial resources they accumulate in the bank and you earn interest. If you are short of funds you apply to the bank for a loan and substantiate your need with the availability of resources and the ability to repay the loan.

**S.D. Yurchenko**: In the past the situation with investment credits was not satisfactory. Frequently loans were used to compensate for the imbalance between production plans and capital construction and the increased cost of construction work or equipment. Loans largely contributed to the reproduction of disproportions rather than to their elimination. It is no accident that so far loans for the installation of new equipment have not become extensively widespread.

Obviously, today we should consider the new quality of credit relations between a bank and an enterprise and credit itself. Conversion to self-financing creates the necessary prerequisites to this effect. In the past the banks were criticized for the numerous restrictions and instructions. Today this question no longer exists. A simple instruction has been drafted on financing and crediting capital construction, which has considerably simplified the procedure for granting loans, naturally without damaging the basic principles of bank crediting.

Currently a system of specialized banks is being created in the country, which will work on the basis of cost accounting and self-financing. Steps are being taken to create specialized banks at large machine building associations. In particular, an agreement has been reached with the ZIL Association on the creation of a specialized bank. Experimentally a form of interrelationship between banks and industry, such as participation in

enterprise profit is being tested. Thus, after concluding a contract with the USSR Ministry of Machine Building and the Rzhev Crane Manufacturing Plant, the USSR Promstroybank allocated funds for creating capacities for the production of new cranes for the country's construction complex, thus becoming a business partner of enterprises interested in end economic production results. The principle is the following: the bank invests a contractually predetermined amount of funds for the creation of capital assets and will participate in the distribution of future profits, which is quite important in terms of its cost accounting interests.

### On the State Order

**V.P. Moskalenko**: The pressing problem for us is that of the forms assumed by such a new development as the state order in terms of practical implementation. Currently in our sector state orders account for more than 80 percent, as is the case with many other sectors. Some people envy us for this, thinking that we have guaranteed supplies and funds.... They forget, however, that according to the procedure for planning the most important variety of items, in the "good old times" if we were short of capacities for the implementation of the plan, like other enterprises, we could prove and substantiate this and we were sometimes listened to and the plan was made consistent with existing capacities. Today the situation is different. We are being told the following: Read in the law where it says that the state orders are "mandatorily included in the plan." So, accept the order. You are independent and act as you wish!

This would be fine if the state orders accounted for 50 to 60 percent, in which case the enterprise could fulfill them by changing the variety; however, when state orders exceed 80 percent and become a "one single order," possibilities to maneuver turn out to be minimal. As a result, the only thing the director can think of is the following: How to succeed in obtaining a plan which can be fulfilled! Regardless of what efforts are being made to interest the enterprises in accepting a stressed plan and however clever incentive systems may be invented, as long as the work of the enterprises will be excessively regulated by the state orders and as long as the enterprises will have to account for the growth rates of gross indicators it would be difficult to expect that a director would stop dreaming of getting an easy plan.

**V.A. Reznichenko**: In terms of state orders, the Sumy NPO indeed finds itself in a special situation. The state order formulated by the USSR Council of Ministers for our sector includes 42 different items (in the past there were 300) and accounts for 66 percent of the volume of output. The share of state orders, broken down by enterprises, ranges between 45 and 95 percent. In the case of the Sumy Association in particular, the state order accounts for 83 percent of output. This is perhaps abnormal but so far we have not found any other solution.



**V.A. Denyak**, director of the Krasnyy Metallist Electrical Engineering Plant in Konotop:

Comrade Moskalenko sought to gain our sympathy on the subject of an excessively high volume of state orders. We would feel sorry for him if we could. Our situation is the precise opposite, for which reason it is a difficult one: our plant produces mining equipment and instruments for safety and means of automation mainly for the coal mining industry.

Our state orders amount to 20 percent of our volume of output. This does not please us, for it could worsen (and will probably do so) the material and technical well-being of the plant. As it were, we are not obtaining at the proper time the resources to which we are entitled.

**A.S. Bakhmut**, deputy general director, Svema Production Association in Shostka:

State orders account for 80 percent for some enterprises and 20 for others; they account for 100 percent at our enterprise. All motion picture and photographic materials are produced on the basis of state orders. We greatly fear the fact that all disproportions and absurdities which are now included in our plan will fall into the strict category of state orders.

For example, during the second quarter of this year the production of 400,000 MK-60 cassettes (for tape recorders) and 745,000 meters of negative color film were added to the plan; the enterprise has neither the capacities nor the raw materials to manufacture them. And all of this will have to be explained to the collective, for the consequences of it will affect its material interests.

**A.D. Ryzhenko**, deputy general director, Nasosenergomash NPO, Sumy:

That which is taking place today within the production management system gives us, practical workers, the feeling that some kind of double game is being played.

On the one hand, we are trying to begin to work under conditions of self-financing; on the other, the local and superior authorities demand of us as in the past a certain volume of output and marketing. I fear that all of this may be included in the state orders. Actually, where is there in self-financing any place for gross indicators? There is none. Why is it that under the conditions of full cost accounting we must be tied to the first of each month and quarter, to resort to rushing and generate losses instead of profits as a result?

Hullabaloo is incompatible with self-financing. It prevents us from working on a long-term basis, handling resources flexibly and developing a backup.

**L.L. Kantorovich**, chief of the planning-economic department, Elektron Production Association:

The state order seems to presume a specific variety of output. Nonetheless, today a state order is essentially expressed in terms of value. Many enterprises are trying to obtain more state orders hoping for a better availability of material resources. But what will the Gosplan say, when it comes to meeting our needs on the basis of a state order formulated in terms of rubles? A state order in terms of value is simply a new name for the old notorious gross output....

**O.M. Yun**: Yes, a paradoxical situation is developing with the state orders. Some enterprises, which have obtained a high percentage of state orders, object, for this paralyzes their initiative in formulating their production program and choosing their partners. Others, with a small share of state orders, call for more, for a state order is a guaranteed market, obtaining material resources, a stable utilization of production capacities and employment for their workers or, in a word, economic prosperity.

The contradiction is obvious. It does exist. Another problem is that whenever the enterprise begins independently to formulate its own production program, aimed at showing a profit, it stops the production of underprofitable items. Market methods, which ensure the production of goods (needed by the consumer) are unavailable for the time being under our conditions. In this case state orders are one of the necessary instruments which enable us to meet the interests of consumers. State orders may not always be something good but without them the situation would be worse. Let me also say something about state orders expressed in terms of value. Let us take as an example light industry. Here a state order covers the entire volume of output. It is obvious that as such the state order is hardly different from mandatory commodity production planning. This is related to the aspiration to ensure within a maximally short time the satisfaction of the population's solvent demand. However, the enterprises have the right to establish their production structure independently. Furthermore, as of now the trade network is rejecting a large number of commodities offered to it. Therefore, light industry is forced to reorganize its production structure in order to produce the specific commodities needed by the customer.

**O.R. Latsis**, KOMMUNIST first deputy editor in chief:

To the best of my understanding, the meaning of the state order was initially the following: by converting to the formulation of enterprise plans on the basis of contracts and orders placed by consumers, we wanted to protect the national interest. This particularly applies to customers not operating on a cost accounting basis or, in simple terms, those not engaged in trade (education, health care, defense, basic science, etc.). The state must ensure that the needs of these areas for scarce commodities are met. I do not understand the reason for state orders placed in terms of value! There are economic incentives which motivate enterprises to increase their

volume of output of commodities which are truly needed by the consumer. If such incentives are insufficient, they should be strengthened and not replaced by the coercion of a state order.

**Ye.G. Yasin**, department head, USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economic-Mathematical Institute:

To try to centralize entirely all material resources with the help of state orders means to preserve intact the existing management system. In order to avoid this we should draw up a list of vitally important scarce goods and only on its basis issue state orders to enterprises and distribute such commodities on a centralized basis. As far as the bulk of the output is concerned, the principle of establishing economic relations should be uniform and take place through the socialist market. Naturally, this involves risk and uncertainties and one can understand those who express concern that confusion in material and technical supplies will intensify. However, if we begin to fear future problems more than we do those which exist today, the latter will become eternal.

**P.G. Bunich:** The main new aspect of the "state order" concept is that the state will demand of the enterprises certain results (in terms of industrial output, building a hospital or scientific and technical development). It should ensure the profitability of such products, by granting benefits in loans, taxation and amortization withholdings and guaranteeing the marketing of such goods.

Obviously, it would be expedient to make use of state orders in pursuing the revolutionary trends of scientific and technical progress. For example, in order to surmount our truly dramatic lagging in computerization, we need a special centralized program and the allocation of state financial resources, including the mechanism of state orders. Our huge country also has regional problems the solution of which is possible only on the level of national programs, such as the development of the Far East, the North, Central Asia, and the Nonchernozem. You will recall that when we were discussing the draft law on the enterprise a number of people criticized the loose formulation which initially defined functions in terms of control figures. The point is that many people feared, not without a reason, that "control figures" would be the new name of mandatory assignments. Today the law clearly stipulates that control figures are not in the nature of directives. In violation of the law, the superior authorities are trying to replace traditional directives with the concept of the state order.

#### **Prices and the Market**

**V.F. Stepanenko**, deputy chairman, USSR State Committee for Prices:

As you know, one of the reforms that we must make is a radical restructuring of the existing price-setting system, for without this it would be impossible to convert the

economy to the principles of self-financing and full cost accounting. We must formulate a price system which would ensure for all sectors equal economic conditions. The base of this new price system, as applicable to all sectors, will be the production cost rate, i.e., the level of expenditures acknowledged by society.... Prices will be based on uniform economic rates formulated for the country as a whole, creating prerequisites for setting up economic incentive funds. For example, the production development fund, which determines the well-being of any enterprise, will be included in the price on the basis of a single amortization rate aimed at the full recovery of assets. The price review will enable us to limit the scale of profit redistribution through the state budget. Enterprise rights in price setting will be increased substantially; this process will be made more democratic and, in order to prevent all of this from leading to a price increase, three instruments will be used: a uniform price-setting methodology, uniform economic rates used in price setting and intensified control over price discipline in the local areas.

**P.G. Bunich:** But now as well, when price setting has been centralized, the prices are rising. What will happen with a "democratization in price setting?" You named three instruments with which to block price increases. Do you have at your disposal anything stronger than these instruments?

**V.F. Stepanenko:** The State Committee for Prices has neither invented nor could invent any more efficient instruments than those I enumerated. However, this is not a question of inventing! If we rely not on abstract considerations but on actual practice, the uniform price-setting methodology and efficient control would be able to hold back price increases.

**P.G. Bunich:** Yet it is precisely such instruments that are being always used in practical life and not in theoretical discussions. On what do you base your confidence that prices will not be sliding upwards?

**O.R. Latsis:** Viktor Feoktistovich, you startled me when you said that the State Committee for Prices has invented nothing other than the instruments you named. In this case no inventive talent is required. Even in a less developed social system the efforts of enterprises not to increase but to reduce prices is quite common. Therefore, in global economic practice this "instrument" has been known for the past several hundred years. The law on the enterprise includes the category of economic competition. This is nothing but a competition for consumers. It is assumed that we shall convert from the present customary but overall irrational situation of the domination of the supplier, to the more natural situation, which is more suitable to society, in which the status of the consumer will be dominant. Naturally, this may sound like fiction, remote from reality as it is in the national economy. However, we would like to put a greater distance between us and the present state of

affairs. If we accept your view the result will be that the enterprises are simply doomed to a struggle for increasing prices. I cannot accept such a gloomy picture.

**V.F. Stepanenko:** I state most categorically that I can simply not conceive of any other ways of countering price increases.

As to references to global experience, today the competition for consumers is unrealistic. Look around you! As long as the necessary material stocks have not been created in the country and as long as there is an acute shortage of even material and technical resources of prime necessity, one cannot seriously speak of any kind of consumer freedom.

**V.G. Starodubrovskiy:** Naturally, the State Committee for Prices should proceed on the basis of the existing situation. However, we shall never solve today's problems if we do not think of those of the future. It is absolutely necessary to control prices. However, this can be efficiently accomplished only with a favorable economic background. We have tremendous surpluses of material values. What is important is to put them in circulation. By itself the control mechanism of the State Committee for Prices, which is aimed against close-order enterprises, could hardly secure for us the results we need.

**L.L. Kantorovich:** The problem of the democratization of price setting is particularly pressing for enterprise economists.

Our association produces the latest equipment needed by science. In order to meet world standards (which is what we are trying to do) we must update our output each 2 to 3 years, as is done by our Japanese and American competitors.

But they should only see the conditions under which we have to work! They have not even an idea of the volume of documents which we must draft and coordinate in order to set the prices of new items. Frequently a designer will develop an instrument faster than it would take to set its price. We spend 2 to 3 years to coordinate documents. What kind of acceleration of progress is this!

Let me say in the presence of the representative of the State Committee for Prices that it is of vital importance to us to have the right independently to set up contractual prices for our instruments, including those which will be produced in series, and to coordinate them with the Academy of Sciences, instead of spending years running around the bureaucratic machinery.

**A.M. Belyakov:** It is clear to everyone now that no full cost accounting can exist without converting to wholesale trade, any more than wholesale trade could exist without full cost accounting. We must develop an efficient socialist market. Nonetheless, for the time being we lack the corresponding infrastructure for it: warehousing capacities must be expanded by a minimum of 100 percent; a system of

wholesale stores and warehouses must be developed, as close to the consumer as possible; a network of commission trade in means of production must be established.... This 5-year plan we are planning the opening of commercial centers in virtually all oblasts, krays and republics. Starting with next year, we must daringly eliminate surpluses which have developed in the national economy (equipment, raw materials, semi-finished goods, etc.), the total value of which, by the most modest estimates, runs into the tens of billions of rubles.

This calls for the organization of fairs at which surplus and unused material values would be sold at contractual prices. An efficient information system on stocks offered for sale should be organized in each rayon and oblast. All of this will make a real contribution to solving problems of chronic shortages, which are largely man-made.

The question of developing commission trade is very difficult. Each enterprise will be offered the choice of supplier and middleman.

Starting with 1988, the needs of the Gosagroprom for goods manufactured by the enterprises of the Minselkhoz mash will be established at regional fairs for agricultural machinery. We believe that this will influence both the quality and structure of output in agricultural machine building, which is today so heavily criticized. The enterprises will be forced to give serious thought to their future.

Nor should we wait for that happy time when a price-setting system will be organized, the more so since we are convinced that this question cannot have a definitive solution. It is necessary efficiently to determine the type of output which could be sold as of now on the basis of contractual and commercial prices and develop, together with the financial authorities and the banks, a system of steps which would enable us to limit the solvent demand of enterprises and to control prices.

Essentially, today in our country no one knows the size of the real need for a specific item. This applies to the consumer, who is concerned with acquiring more stocks, the producer and the middleman.

Matters are worsened by the fact that by no means are all producers willing to offer their products on the market; not all customers dream of wholesale trade. In this area a great deal of work must be done to eliminate existing stereotypes and to retrain procurement and general economic cadres. The notorious figure of the procurement pusher must yield to that of people operating in the new system, who are comfortable with the market and with the contemporary production process and have a taste for new developments.

The tasks which have been set are specific. By 1990 the share of wholesale trade in the overall volume of marketed commodities should reach 60 percent; it should rise to 75-80 percent by 1992. The remainder will consist of output allocated on a centralized basis.

**O.M. Yun:** Currently the Ministry of Science, health care and many other consumers have already been converted to wholesale trade. All of them are dissatisfied. They are dissatisfied because they are unable to purchase whatever they need. You are permitting wholesale trade under conditions of scarcity. This, however, could intensify the chaos! There will be frequent cases in which goods will not reach those who need them mostly from the viewpoint of the interests of the state.

**A.M. Belyakov:** However, we must not ignore the positive results of wholesale trade. In Belorussia, for example, where scientific research organizations and some nonindustrial consumer ministries have been converted to wholesale trade, use of material resources declined by 15 percent. In 1987 in Estonia the increased volume of construction work was ensured without increasing the consumption of material resources. I see no reason to fear any worsening of supplies even by concentrating resources in the hands of territorial authorities. The main prerequisite for improving procurements is displaying greater realism in planning. This is because anything pertaining to material and technical procurements proceeds from the plan.

I hope that you will agree with me that all of us are short of knowledge concerning the national interests, particularly in the long term.

**Ye.G. Yasin:** In discussing problems of shortages by the personnel of central economic authorities, the impression frequently develops that it is a question of some kind of natural catastrophe which is totally independent of their will rather than the natural results of the decisions made by such authorities. Nonetheless, we must not forget that the main source of the difficulty is the grave financial disproportions in the national economy and the surplus of money in circulation. It is indeed true that the Gosplan by itself cannot solve the problem of surmounting shortages and establish an efficient organization of wholesale trade unless we stop the flow of surplus cash which clogs the circulation channels. Naturally, this is above all the task of the Ministry of Finance, which is responsible for a problem which is of the utmost importance today to our economy: ensuring the full value of the ruble.

**V.P. Loginov:** The problem of the producer's diktat will torture us for as long as we are unable to eliminate the monopoly status in production. The excessively narrow specialization in the production of finished goods leads to the fact that frequently the consumer is deprived of the possibility of choosing his supplier. How can he

choose when one or two plants produce a specific commodity for the entire country. Naturally, this problem cannot be solved quickly but must be borne in mind and must be solved.

**V.G. Starodubrovskiy:** We have been lulling ourselves for a long time with talk on the advantages of a centralized planning system but have done very little to make use of such advantages. Under the conditions of a conversion to full cost accounting it has become quite apparent that even our progressive enterprises are substantially behind the leading capitalist companies in terms of strategic planning. To us even price forecasting seems fiction for the time being. Yet without this self-financing is impossible. Without the ability to forecast prices we cannot assess the cost accounting efficiency of capital investments and plan financial resources. These problems were encountered by the Sumy NPO imeni M.V. Frunze. Yet it is important for us not only to create a socialist market but also to learn how to manage it.

#### Wages

**I.S. Lyalko,** general director, Elektron Production Association:

For a long time we were raised in a spirit of equalization and this could not fail to affect us. Equalization trends have become part of our flesh and blood. In our enterprise some workers earned as much as 700 rubles in bonuses, although these were rare occasions. Honestly speaking, we are unwilling to grant significant salary increases and bonuses despite the fact that we have the right to do so and know that we are paying for better work. We are scared. We are as yet profoundly to master the principle according to which only those who work better have the right to live better.

**Yu.N. Titushkin,** director, Sumselmash Plant:

I agree! I too fear to pay a foreman for his work (the very word generates respect—foreman!) 300 to 400 rubles per month. We are hindered not only by prejudices but also by a much more tangible factor: instructions, which no one has deleted! Give a foreman even a 50 percent salary supplement his salary would still not exceed 200 rubles monthly. It is the labor collective and not an instruction that should determine how much a specific worker should earn, based on his contribution to the work.

**Yu.P. Kokin,** deputy director, Scientific Research Labor Institute:

What kind of prohibitions are you talking about?! Today the enterprises have quite extensive rights in the area of wages. The problem is that the enterprises are still making use of their rights very timidly....

**V.P. Moskalenko:** Indeed, we do not use the rights which we have and there is no justification for us to complain. Foremen and workers can be given bonuses from the material incentive fund with practically no restrictions. We can pay bonuses based on their labor contribution!

**Yu.N. Titushkin:** Vladimir Petrovich! My possibilities are different from yours and I find it very difficult to convince an endless series of investigators that the enterprise indeed has such rights now. Clearly, we must develop a specific regulation, a document to which we could refer in substantiating the wages paid to various worker categories.

**V.P. Moskalenko:** No regulation is necessary in order to act in accordance with the laws. If an investigator asks you why you are exercising state-given rights, your answer should be because you have the right to do so! I realize that in some cases this is difficult to do but no other way is possible. A struggle is needed. Each one of us must struggle for his own project in his own place.

#### **Cost Accounting and Territory**

**L.P. Chizhov,** department chief, Sumy Oblast Executive Committee:

Although there are no basic differences between the local management organs and the enterprises in our oblast, difficulties exist and have increased of late.

This is because both the rights of the soviets in economic activities and the rights of enterprises are being simultaneously increased. This is the reason for the contradictions which appear. The difficulty is that the rights granted to the local soviets are above all administrative. They are inconsistent with the new economic and political situation in the country.

**V.P. Moskalenko:** Yes, indeed, the ministry has drastically reduced the number of indicators issued to enterprises. However, as Lomonosov himself pointed out, what you cover in one spot you uncover in another. The range of indicators which we must coordinate with the local authorities was increased quickly. Essentially, we received from the local authorities the same old list of demands which we previously received from the ministry. We say that the soviet of people's deputies must be the master of the city and everyone agrees with this (for we too are its citizens). But what kind of master is it when it comes to local finances! The result is that the local authorities must, by hook or by crook, take from the enterprises, to meet the needs of the city, the funds which they are entitled to by virtue of ownership rights.

Actually, our association has substantial economic incentive funds. We build housing and kindergartens. However, we do not wish to set up a city within the city, although many enterprises have taken this path. Alas, the result is a poor city, consisting of poor little cities in

which people live poorly. The local soviet has neither the funds nor the possibility of organizing a normal life in the city. Does it not want to? Naturally, it does, but it cannot!

We are convinced, therefore, that depending on their wage fund, the enterprises should pay out of their own profits local taxes going to the local budget. In short, enterprise self-financing should be such as to create the necessary conditions for the local soviets to be interested in the better work of labor collectives.

However, under the new conditions both soviet and party authorities will have to reorganize themselves. Before "issuing an order," they must learn to think of what this will mean to the enterprise executing it. This applies to recruiting people for agricultural work and, in general, all kinds of projects euphemistically described as sponsorship.

The law stipulates that the cost of taking people away from their jobs should be paid by the enterprise on the basis of economic contracts. If this regulation is honored in practice, fewer people would be recruited, order would improve and the country would benefit.

**L.P. Chizhov:** For the time being, we are indeed unable to talk to enterprises converted to self-financing and cost accounting in the language of economics. If we learn this language, everyone would benefit.

**V.A. Krasko:** Could we be told what guided the oblast executive committee when it issued our plant additional assignments without securing proper material resources?

**M.G. Siryachenko,** deputy general director, Khimprom Production Association in Sumy:

In general, I would like to learn why the local soviet authorities can issue enterprises assignments for the production of consumer goods and for providing paid services to the population without providing them with the necessary resources.

**L.P. Chizhov:** I shall answer this willingly: you know that the oblast executive committee has the right to issue additional assignments to enterprises in all sectors for the production of consumer goods. The oblast is interested in issuing such assignments, for the corresponding goods will remain at the disposal of the oblast and will meet the needs of the working people. Our oblast is overfulfilling the plan for the production of consumer goods although the lion's share of such goods is shipped to other areas in the country. The oblast produces consumer goods worth approximately 2 rubles per ruble of wages invested in their production. However, trade depends not on what we produce but on the amount of goods left at our disposal to sell in our own stores. As a result, this year's trade plan fell short of commodity resources worth 90 million rubles. That is why we are

forced to issue additional assignments for the production of consumer goods to all enterprises, for this entire output will remain in the oblast.

Naturally, we realize that we are making use of purely administrative levers and thus objectively encouraging economic managers to conceal their reserves. However, for the time being no solution to this problem exists.

**O.M. Yun:** Of late we have reduced the production of wines and hard liquor. Now everyone is turning to the Gosplan with demand for resources to meet population needs. Where will these resources come from, considering that the goods are produced at enterprises located in specific areas. The local authorities have the right now to increase the production of consumer goods and to develop corresponding commodity resources. Therefore, one must make skillful use of these rights instead of appealing to superior management authorities!

**L.P. Chizhov:** It would be wrong to say that we do nothing to make use of local resources. For example, we have undertaken to market industrial waste to the population and such sales have increased sharply. For the oblast as a whole, the production of consumer goods is increasing rapidly. However, we must not encourage a barter economy! To rely on our own resources exclusively would be simply stupid. The people need a great deal of items which are neither produced nor could be produced in our oblast. Such problems can be solved only through the normally operating union-wide market in consumer goods.

**G.V. Povkh,** associate, Sumy branch of the Kharkov Polytechnical Institute:

I would like to touch upon a very important problem in which the interests of the enterprise and the territory become most closely intertwined: environmental protection. The question of the environment has been practically ignored in the current economic mechanism. This could worsen the general ecological situation. It is difficult to develop a national policy based merely on enthusiasm and conscientiousness when huge funds are required. We believe that a special system of withholding rates should be introduced (those who consume less water and pollute less should pay less) for the use of natural resources. Such rates should encourage a conversion to ecologically clean technologies.

#### Self-Financing and Cadres

**A.P. Savchenko,** head of the economic department, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee:

In analyzing the results of economic activities of republic enterprises operating on the basis of full cost accounting, we can see that they have not work as well as they could. We were faced with the fact (to be expected) that by no means is everyone accepting the conditions of self-financing. Although no one is mentioning this out loud,

many people are hindering through their actions the conversion to the new economic management methods. We must abandon the illusion that the cadres have the automatic ability to adapt to any type of working conditions. Alas, many of them cannot. They must be replaced. It seems to me that the search for and retraining of cadres is one of the most important tasks of the party committees. If a manager is unable normally to organize internal production cost accounting his enterprise will almost certainly encounter major difficulties in converting to self-financing.

**V.P. Moskalenko:** I believe that internal cost accounting, which is currently practiced at the enterprises is not, as a rule, adapted to the conditions of real self-financing. Today cost accounting must be the concern of designers, technologists and brigade leaders and, particularly, of enterprise directors who frequently issue orders without considering their economic consequences. We frequently criticize the ministry and the party authorities. However, the labor collective councils of enterprises converting to full cost accounting should become aware of the economic consequences of the orders of their own directors.

Generally speaking, self-government is most closely related to full cost accounting. Unless there is true self-financing, it is only managers considered "good" and those who will "not harm others" that will be appointed. It is only when it becomes clear that the well-being of the collective and its members depends on end labor results that we shall begin to appoint people who are knowledgeable, principle-minded and exigent, people who can organize the work. Economics will dictate the selection.

The frank discussion which was held at the Sumy Machine Building Scientific-Production Association imeni M.V. Frunze, it seems to us, made it possible to highlight the most essential problems in the practical implementation of the radical economic reform. They affect everyone: workers, economic managers, the personnel of central economic, party and soviet agencies, and scientists. The roundtable indicated that not one of them had satisfactory answers to the difficult problems raised by reality. Naturally, this is not to say that we must wait and delay the radical restructuring in economic management: an offensive is not postponed until the time when even the last soldier has sewed up his last button. Clearly, answers should be sought in close cooperation with practical workers and scientists and as we listen to the pulse-beat of restructuring. In order for a mass conversion to the new economic mechanism to turn into a real implementation of our plans, we need the painstaking work of the central economic institutions for its organization, the training of cadres to work under changed circumstances and the enhancement of research, closely related to practical needs.

Currently we are experiencing the inevitable difficulties of the transitional period and it is important to realize this in order objectively to assess what is taking place in

the economy today. A most difficult and objectively conflicting process of transformation of the system of production relations is taking place. That is why it is particularly important today to keep assessing the situation soberly and neither to exaggerate isolated accomplishments nor become panicky by the fact that not everything is being achieved immediately.

The resolutions of the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum armed us with a clear integral program for economic reorganization. Its systematic implementation is a prerequisite for success.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### 'A Time for Specific Deeds and Specific Responsibility'

18020006d Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 34-43

[Article by Nikolay Grigoryevich Tyurin, deputy editor KOMMUNIST Party Construction and State and Public Organizations Department]

[Text] The title of this article, borrowed from a letter to the editors, accurately describes the main topic of the journal's mail which deals with problems of party life, raised by the current stage of restructuring. As part of an entity, this mail necessarily shares features inherent in the entire flood of letters reaching the editors of KOMMUNIST. Let us note above all a sharp quantitative increase: in the first 10 months of this year, the party construction, and state and social organizations department received more letters than the same period in 1986 by a factor of 2.5 and, compared with the 1985 level, by a factor of 3.5. Naturally, however, it is not merely a question of figures. The quality of the letters themselves has noticeably changed.

Let us note above all the analytical nature and concentrated considerations of the role of the party in society and its ways and means of action in terms of the new conditions based on the democratization of all social life and the radical economic reform, in many of the letters. This tendency of the readers to engage in a questioning debate with the journal is natural. As was noted at the CPSU Central Committee Conference at which tasks of party work on ensuring the main trends of the new stage in restructuring were discussed, it is only those who have no intention of changing anything that believe everything to be clear. Society is already changing and will continue to change in the course of its democratization and in mastering the new economic mechanism. Consequently, as is emphasized in many of the letters, the party's collective thinking must today persistently intensify its efforts in solving topical problems. What specifically is of interest to the readers?

Pressing and broad problems related to perfecting the work style of party organizations and their party committees, the shaping and training of party cadres, expanding intraparty democracy and strengthening and, in some cases, reviving principle-mindedness as the prime foundation for the behavior and the actions of party members in all areas of social life are raised considerably more frequently than before April 1985. Many of the letters deal with the pressing problems in the area of ideological work. Virtually every day we find in the mail views on means of strengthening the unity between words and actions, statements on the moral aspect of the party member, studies of the reasons for negative phenomena and suggestions concerning their decisive elimination. Even more typical is the readers' description of their views on current socioeconomic processes as compared with the recent and more distant past, their strong interest in party history and the lessons to be drawn from it. As the mail emphasizes, preparations for the anniversary of the Great October Revolution became for many party members and nonparty comrades a time for interpreting the past and our achievements and losses. A noteworthy and virtually universal feature of the letters we receive is the sincerity of the tone and reliance on personal experience and the aspiration honestly to assess the past and one's own position in restructuring and to earmark guidelines for the future. Clearly, it is no accident that a large group of letters deal with a sharp topic such as the struggle between the old and the new in the context of the specific labor collective and its party organization. With increasing frequency readers link their thoughts and suggestions to preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

Along with interesting and useful thoughts and convincing arguments, the materials we receive frequently contain arguable views and, occasionally, clearly erroneous assertions and demagogic notes. However, as we quote some of these letters here, we deliberately do not engage in an expanded polemic on each subject, for the main purpose of this survey is to present the fullest possible range of opinions of the journal's readership. Furthermore, in subsequent issues we shall be able to offer those who support different viewpoints an opportunity to have their say.

### Course of Democratization

Labor Veteran A. Ivanov (Rubezhnoye, Voroshilovgrad Oblast), a KOMMUNIST reader since 1928, who begins his letter with praise of the journal, notes that more than ever before the editors should pay attention to problems of party organizational work or, more specifically, to unity between this work and the tasks of restructuring. What specifically does he mean? "Long years of participation in political life," A. Ivanov writes, "gives me the right to draw the conclusion that the errors for which the people must pay a high price have always been preceded by a weakening of the party." Citing familiar examples from party history, the author analyzes the consequences



of violations of intraparty democracy and of lowering the role of collective agencies. First to suffer is criticism from below (control, glasnost, etc.). Criticism from above assumes dominant importance. This is the organizational (as well as the ideological and philosophical, according to our reader) foundation for voluntarism. Naturally, A. Ivanov emphasizes, many honest party members have tried to prevent the violation of the Leninist principles of democratic centralism. As a rule, however, everything has ended with sticking labels and drawing "organizational conclusions." The party press kept silent.... The letter ends with the following appeal: "I believe that it is precisely now that KOMMUNIST should make its contribution to the formulation of a truly scientific definition of party democracy and to a study of the dialectics of centralism and the free expression of the will of every party member under contemporary conditions."

This is a serious wish, the more so because, judging by the editorial mail, interest in the life of the party organizations, party democratization above all, is truly tremendous. Obviously, it is within the many voices of the readers that one should look for the starting points, the topics for subsequent materials, articles and reports on roundtable meetings. What directions will be followed today in the search for new ideas and approaches to the problem of developing intraparty democracy which, unquestionably, is firmly related to strengthening socialist democracy in society? Let us take as an example the material we received from A. Gavristov, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Biochemistry and Physiology of Microorganisms (Moscow).

Citing excerpts from the CPSU statutes to the effect that "the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the tested battle vanguard of the Soviet people," and that the "CPSU, which remains in terms of its class nature the ideology of the party of the working class, has become the party of the whole people," A. Gavristov expresses the following thought: one must totally accept the stipulations of the statutes on the existence of a close tie between the party and society. However, it is precisely for this reason that corrections must be made in the current practice of accepting party members. As the main proof of his view, the author of this letter draws up the following logical conclusion: "According to the CPSU statutes, a person can be accepted in the party only as a result of the expression of the will of the CPSU members themselves. The people, the labor collective, the bulk of which consists of the nonparty members of society, have no practical attitude toward party membership. At best the nonparty members participate in discussing party membership applications at open party meetings. However, we must not forget that a candidate is considered at such a meeting after he has been recommended by the party members and supported by the party bureau. This gives a certain predetermined nature to such discussions. It is a manifestation of a substantial

contradiction between statements concerning the democratic nature of the party and the undemocratic system of joining it. Given this situation we, party members, have the right to speak only on behalf of the party members and no one else."

In his letter, A. Gavristov suggests two interrelated means of strengthening the ties between the party and the nonparty mass. First, he believes, we must change the system for party enrollment in such a way that those who join the party must, in addition to the recommendation of party members, be recommended by the labor collective and all recommendations have equal status. Second, party members should be comprehensively and regularly subject to certification at meetings of labor collectives. Such certification should be completed by giving (or denying) a kind of "vote of confidence" by the collective for every party member. In the opinion of the author of this letter, this approach would contribute to the confident enhancement of the party's authority and influence, to the true assessment of its combat capability and the exposure of specific cadre errors, the elimination of the "stereotype" of nonspecific criticism targeted not at leading cadres (which today are subject to the close attention of the press and public opinion) but the rank-and-file party membership, which is quite heterogeneous from the viewpoint of readiness for and possibility of solving reconstruction problems.

A similar problem is discussed by V. Afanasyev (Leningrad), who writes on problems of the further development of the political system of our state. In analyzing the consequences of the strict centralization of management in the party, state and economic areas, the author notes that despite the rich legacy of the Marxist-Leninist classics and existing Soviet experience in the management of society, the task of elaborating a scientific theory of a political party in a socialist society remains extremely topical. "For example," he emphasizes, "Article 60 of the CPSU statutes stipulates that the CPSU provides political guidance to state and public organizations. However, neither the statutes nor the CPSU program describe the nature of this most important party function. This offers possibilities for arbitrary interpretation by some specific party organizations of any specific function in the course of practical activities and creates a potential for bureaucratic administration, duplication and abuse."

We have quoted only from three letters in the journal's mail but, we believe, they are a clear example of a noteworthy phenomenon to which the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum drew attention: life in our society is characterized by the growth of civic activity among all population strata, initiative-mindedness in the formulation of new problems, surmounting accumulated inertias, and a growing aspiration on the part of the people to assume responsibility for social affairs and for the further development of the democratic principles in the country. Unquestionably, many of the questions formulated in the letters demand a thoughtful analysis



and a comparison among different views expressed by scientist and practical workers. However, the formulation itself of major problems of essential significance is a confirmation of the profound processes of restructuring which are taking place today in the consciousness of party and nonparty members. The general trend is clear: more democracy in party life and in society as a whole.

Problems of democratization of party life, strengthening the principles of glasnost and collectivism in the work, and the creation within each party organization of an atmosphere of comradeship and bolshevik principledness are discussed in the letters sent by V. Rasskazov (Vilnyus), V. Chudov (Moscow), B. Yatsko (Kiev), S. Goreslavskiy (Stavropol), A. Polosin (Lipetsk), A. Solovyev (Grodno), A. Skrebets (Kiev) and many others. Unfortunately, the limitations of a survey do not allow us to consider in detail all the materials received by the editors. Nonetheless let us mention here, perhaps merely as a simple enumeration, the problems which interest the readers of KOMMUNIST: the need for the extensive use of sociological surveys in party organizations; changing the system for evaluating the work of party buros and party committees from a two-point to a three-point system ("unsatisfactory," "satisfactory" and "good," which, in the view of our reader, would make it possible for the party members to express more accurately their attitude toward the activities of the comrades); setting specific times for holding meetings—twice monthly or monthly (extending the stipulation of the party statutes on the periodicity of meetings "no less than once every 2 months" to all primary organizations would make it possible to make substantially better preparations for the meetings); a certain change in the periods of accountability and election campaigns, from August-October to January-March ("however much they may wish it, spending a great deal of effort in preparing for the meetings, the party organization secretary and the party-economic aktiv are unable to single out the long-term problems, for the main problem concerning all of them is the implementation of the annual plan, which is the main topic of their discussions"); revising the criteria for the size of party organizations, according to which an excessively large number of party secretaries find themselves "unrelieved" of their duties.

We believe that even such a brief enumeration gives an idea of the range of opinions expressed by the readers of KOMMUNIST on the practical assignments which demand a study and resolution. Many of the materials received by the editors deal with problems of party cadre policy at the contemporary stage. Each one of them invariably emphasizes the tremendous importance of successfully solving this problem in terms of the outcome of restructuring. In terms of the number of manuscripts, the scope of arguments and the energetic nature of conclusions, these views of the readers are one of the "basic" areas of our mail. Its sources are the decisions of the January CPSU Central Committee Plenum and their refraction in current practical activities.

The manuscripts sent by A. Sanin, docent at the Shakhty branch of the Novocherkassk Polytechnical Institute (Rostov Oblast) are prefaced by a few lines in which the author motivates his discussion of cadre problems as follows: "I am profoundly convinced that if we do not truly restore the Leninist criteria in the selection of party cadres we would be drowned in an avalanche of unsolved problems. I am referring to the cadres of the oblast, city and rayon party committees who were chosen on the basis of the old criteria and who are the least capable of restructuring." A biographic reference shows that A. Sanin has been a party member for 40 years. He is a veteran of the Great Patriotic War and spent 15 years in party work. He is a candidate of philosophical sciences and a graduate of the CPSU Central Committee Higher Party School.

In addressing himself to the pre-October period in party history, and the first decade after the October Revolution, the author draws the conclusion that the successes in party building and in the party's struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution and the purity and ideological unity within party ranks were determined, to a tremendous extent, by the unity between scientific and organizational-practical activities, which were inherent in V.I. Lenin and his fellow-workers. As we know, as the party's Central Committee general secretary, J.V. Stalin made major theoretical errors and committed serious violations of the principles of party democracy and socialist legality. Unquestionably, this hindered the country's development, paralyzed Marxist-Leninist thinking and distorted party policy. The best people in the party tried to oppose the phenomena triggered by the cult of Stalin's personality. The death of the leaders in the Leninist party galaxy marked essentially the end of the period in which major party workers combined within themselves the features of ideologue and organizer.

In analyzing the reasons for stagnation phenomena in the economy and other areas of social activity in recent decades, A. Sanin reduces them essentially to the unnatural, to quote his words, division between theoretical and practical activities: "That which was pointed out by powerless theoreticians and publicists was not seen and, in some cases, deliberately ignored by the omnipotent managers of ministries and departments." The profound forces of economic and sociopsychological breakdowns and deformations were ignored by the local party authorities as well. As a rule, specialists in industry and agriculture were recommended for positions of party obkom, gorkom and raykom secretaries. Heading a party buro and apparatus, they naturally concentrated their attention on problems which they understood well, i.e., on the technical and economic aspects of the production process. They frequently could not even notice the ulcers which were corroding the moral climate in the area and the economy under their guidance....

The simple conclusion which A. Sanin draws in his letter is the following: a restructuring in the mentality and way of thinking of party cadres and a change in priorities and

in the style of their activities requires that the technocratic approach applied in their appointment be changed. This is necessary in order to ensure the successful solution not only of ideological and political but also of national economic problems, for man is the main and the most complex "element" in any production process.

In the opinion of A. Miroshnichenko, party buro secretary at the shop party organization of the Second Odessa Aerospace Enterprise, the democratic solution of cadre problems is hindered by the following five factors: the fact that in frequent cases there is only one candidate, the multiple-step system followed in the choice of a party leader, the lack of publicity in organizing a reserve, insufficient time for the discussion of candidacies and, finally, the excessive influence "from above" on voting results.

Naturally, extremes are inadmissible in the development of democratic principles in cadre policy, for it is precisely party discipline that allows us to observe here a collectively formulated line of action. "The disparity in selections of party leaders," A. Miroshnichenko writes, "is that on the one hand elections for a given organization are a local problem; on the other, however, their importance is so great that it is impossible to make such decisions autonomous." For that reason, the author of this letter suggests that we consider additional steps which, in the case of solving cadre problems, should ensure the necessary balance between the views expressed "from above" and "from below."

Following is the viewpoint of retired Lieutenant General A. Lezin (Leningrad), head of department at the All-Union Institute for Upgrading the Skills of Managerial Workers and Specialists in Vocational-Technical Education: one of the main trends in the struggle against the degeneracy of cadres and the alienation of leading personnel from the party organizations is training in the practice of party work, knowledge of which by most specialists in a great variety of economic fields is considered, by the author of this letter, clearly inadequate. To this effect, A. Lezin suggests that a special subject be introduced in VUZs and, particularly, in institutes and departments for skill upgrading. According to him, not only scientists but also people with great experience in party work, regardless of educational degree, could read lectures and head the work of the respective departments. Furthermore, he notes, an interpretative collection of recommendations and documents of the CPSU Central Committee on preparations for and holding party meetings, organizing the implementation of their resolutions, supervising the activities of administrations, and so on, would be of great help to those who are now assuming the leadership of primary and other organizations. Such work should be published in a truly large edition.

A great portion of the editorial mail consists of letters on the growth of party ranks and the procedure for joining the CPSU. As is the case with all areas of party building,

the journal's readers are equally interested in problems of a maximally wide social importance as well as local and seemingly superficial events in daily practice, in which general laws are manifested one way or another.

For example, in the manuscript by G. and Ye. Blyum (Obninsk, Kaluga Oblast), entitled "Changes in CPSU Membership in 80 Years and in the Immediate Future," based on statistical figures, a number of conclusions are reached on developing and current trends in the party structure. For example, according to the authors in order to ensure the continuity and change of generations, the party must maintain the pace of annual growth of young party members at no less than 2-4 percent of the total party membership. Furthermore, according to the authors, currently the number of party members has reached 10 percent of the adult active part of the country's population and any possible further intensive growth of CPSU membership requires thorough study and substantiation.

The following view is also contained in this material: "There is within the party a certain stratum of the economic, state and party apparatus which betrayed the interests of the working people and dishonored itself by violating the norms of communist morality and which undermines the reputation of the CPSU." Based on materials in the periodical press, the authors compute the size of this stratum. However, here is the thought that comes to mind on this subject: since such computations are quite arbitrary and to a certain extent scholastic, would it not be more useful, instead of engaging in such statistical studies, to engage in a real and open opposition to entirely specific degenerates of various types and violators of statutory norms and rules of socialist community living? Obviously, a certain percentage of opportunists have been and are members of our party, which is in power. However, they account for an insignificant minority and restructuring, which is gathering strength, will tangibly contribute to their exposure. Furthermore, we must not ignore another exceptionally topical task: the fastest possible elimination of the passive attitude shown by many party members, who behave impeccably judging by formal criteria, and helping them to assume an aggressive position in our common project.

The following few letters do not submit any kind of summations: those by V. Khachiyev (Ashkhabad), L. Parfenova (Gomel), I. Sklyar (Kiev) and other comrades describe manifestations of formalism and bureaucratic indifference which they have encountered in submitting petitions for party membership or references they have given to new party members. On each such occasion a "clash" has hurt the people and affected their labor and civic activeness. The CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of the Tashkent Oblast Party Organization on the Acceptance of Party Members and Strengthening Party Ranks" describes typical thoughts in this most important work, many of which are described, one way or another, in the letters to the editors.

We shall not reproduce here the facts and evaluations contained in such letters. Naturally, they must be further checked on-site and we shall try to describe the results in subsequent issues.

### **The Spiritual Potential of Everyone Must Advance the Common Cause**

A significant percentage of our mail consists of letters in which problems of restructuring party and other areas of social life are considered on a very broad level with abundant summations and energetically sounding conclusions. One way or another, many readers link the prospects for the renovation of socialism to improvements in ideological work at the present stage and to the broadening and intensification of the means of party influence on the minds and hearts of the people. What is behind this craving for "general problems?" Naturally, it is the aspiration to make a contribution to the tremendous innovative work initiated by the party, the purpose of which is the profoundly scientific and creative interpretation of the ways and means of democratization of socialist society and the maximal utilization of its intellectual and moral potential. Equally present here is the desire for surmounting more rapidly and efficiently the "taboo" on the democratic and open discussion of acute problems, typical of socialist practice, which was typical of the period of stagnation.

"The theoretical aspects of restructuring cannot fail to interest every single party member," notes A. Denisov, a party worker in Krasnoarmeysk, in his letter. "Unquestionably, their formulation must be the work of highly professional specialists, for amateurs here are unacceptable. Nonetheless, the current stage in the country's life dictates the need for universal participation in discussions, for we come across a number of different ideas and suggestions, ranging from erroneous to entirely acceptable and constructive. A serious problem is that of solving the contradiction between 'professionalism' and 'dilettantism' in the study of sociopolitical problems and to make this contradiction useful for society." Briefly, the suggestion of A. Denisov may be reduced to the following:

First, a periodical should have a special topic page (section) in which a description and variants of solutions of one universally significant problem or another would be described. Second, a competent study of readers' suggestions concerning the various choices should be provided; information should be published on the course of the implementation of suggestions, along with investigations and other materials which would promote glasnost and increase the efficiency of all work.

Understandably, the author emphasizes, to a certain extent all of this may be found today in materials published in the central press and in television programs. The task, however, is to give such rather disparate initiatives a systematic, a purposeful nature. According to A. Denisov, particular attention should be paid to

formulating a reliable mechanism for the implementation of suggestions which have been comprehensively tested. This approach, the letter notes, would help to upgrade intellectual and civic activeness in a variety of important areas of improvement of our economy and in other aspects of social life and rally more energetically the "political army" engaged in solving complex problems, facilitate the conversion of "negative" to "constructive" feelings and organize the training of the people in the field of scientific methodology on a mass scale. The author classifies the identification of creative and initiative-minded people as part of the expected positive results of his suggestion.

The enhancement of the human factor, the processes of democratization of social life and the release of the constructive potential of every individual for the sake of successful restructuring are the central topic of the mail to the editors pertaining to the macroproblems, so to say, of party building.

For example, in discussing the passive attitude and the lack of personality of many party groups and ways of surmounting this fault, A. Dzyura, teacher at the Norilsk Evening Studies Industrial Institute, cites as an example the following situation: in actively working party groups with a high standard of group (essentially collectivistic) awareness, every individual is naturally integrated in both the "long-term" community (the CPSU as a whole) and the immediate microcommunity (the party group). However, in frequent cases there are conflicting collectives and party organizations in which the party member refuses to be a member of the party, claiming that he would not wish to be outside the CPSU "as a whole," but would like to break his ties with a given party organization which, allegedly, is pursuing a line conflicting with the general party line. Such a substitution of the general for the specific, takes place, according to the author, because of the underdeveloped awareness of some party members, which is greatly assisted by different concepts according to which a "communist ideology" is automatically mastered by a person the moment he joins the CPSU. That is why we need the formulation of new and efficient means of developing in every party member the qualities which the party and all of its members need today. The primary party units are the main places providing such education.

"There are no minor or major affairs in the management of human relations," writes V. Kalantayevskiy, Alma-Ata, in an article entitled "Acceleration: Where and How?" which he sent to the journal. "The party apparatus we set up to this effect is burdened by a variety of economic problems. The most important problem in improving our society—education—has been left to the information media, i.e., it has been virtually deprived of daily and purposeful guidance. Naturally, the party agencies have their propaganda departments. However, the mere enumeration of their obligations reveals the inevitable overloading of the apparatus with bureaucratic

procedures. The actual result is a lack of system and chaos rather than the guidance of human relations and their development...."

What does the author suggest? Above all, cleansing the ideological area from "extraneous" factors. The truth, according to him, is for ideology and education to be handled by specialists who are absolutely clean, not to mention the avoidance of people guilty of negative actions which develop on the grounds of an imperfect organization in material production. "On this basis," he goes on to say, "the main and perhaps only target in the work of party authorities on the republic, oblast and rayon levels, should be the formulation and implementation of plans for political, patriotic, international and cultural-aesthetic upbringing, and maintaining the necessary sociopsychological condition in the society...."

This view is by no means uncontroversial. However, bearing in mind our promise of not starting an argument (here and now) related to viewpoints to which one may object, let us set aside this part of the article in which the author literally separates the superstructure from the base, considering ideology as something isolated from the material environment, as well as the rather categorical claims concerning lack of control and system in educational work. What is noteworthy is something else: the author sharply criticizes real shortcomings typical of the current condition in the ideological subdivisions of party committees. He speaks of the intensification of paper shuffling in their work. Where is the solution to this situation in which ideological workers deal much more successfully with statistical data on "implemented measures" than with actually existing views and moods of the "individual" person?

Clearly, no simple answer is possible. The overall trend of research is given in the CPSU Central Committee resolution on restructuring the political and economic training of the working people. Naturally, however, a radical improvement must be made in the "technology" of party committee educational activities. A number of specific suggestions on this account may be found in the editorial mail. Thus, in analyzing the course of restructuring of ideological work, T. Gudima, docent at the Arkhangelsk Industrial Forestry Institute, suggests a comprehensive program which would reflect the unity of objectives and the content, ways and means of upbringing and determine the place of each one of these areas and the ways of their interaction. In his view, the ties between ideological work and life must be firmly strengthened. This has always been considered the leading stipulation of our propaganda. However, a difference between people who "agitate" and those who "do the work" has become firmly established in our practical activities. According to the author of the letter, training people with the help of history becomes a particularly important area under contemporary conditions. The tremendous interest in history must be satisfied. This applies, above all, to the complex periods in our development.

These views are greatly concretized and expanded by V. Fetisov, professor, department of philosophy and scientific communism, Voronezh Institute of Forestry Engineering, who discusses the present situation of social science teachers in VUZs. According to the author, without waiting for instructions from the ministry, the party organizations in the social science departments could already make substantial changes for the better in this area of restructuring. However, the letter emphasizes, this has not taken place in most VUZs around the country. Why? By inertia the educational process is assessed according to the number of documents and measures and assigning to social scientists numerous projects which are unrelated to the training process. Furthermore, V. Fetisov believes, frequently the active opponents of changes are social scientists who find it suitable to take into consideration people needed by the institute and who are members of the party buro or party committee, despite the extremely unsatisfactory (in terms of contemporary standards) condition of training and scientific work. No appeals would help VUZ social sciences as long as the party members in each institute or university do not undertake to work on the basis of the positions dictated by present-day requirements.

Following is an opinion expressed by a reader, confirmed by long years of practical experience in an area in which ideology and life, and theory and practice are most closely interwoven. "I am convinced that the newspapers published by labor and VUZ collectives and local radio broadcasts are the most important tool of restructuring," emphasizes in his letter A. Shvarts, editor of the newspaper FREZER (Moscow). "More than one-half of the more than 8,000 newspapers published in the country are classified as 'small.' However, together with roughly 5,000 factory-plant radio broadcasting studios (whose problems are very similar to ours), plant newspapers extend their influence over tens of millions of people."

Having considered in detail and with suitable proof the situation of the personnel of the "small" press and the local radio broadcasting studios, and the numerous organizational and technical difficulties which they encounter in their work, the author concludes that we need a standard regulation on the publication of local newspapers (radio) and comprehensive standard cost estimates and official instructions governing the work of their associates. It is precisely the lack of regulations that, according to A. Shvarts, is one of the reasons for the fact that a substantial creative potential available in this segment of our journalism is so far not being used to its fullest extent. Finally, in order to increase the efficiency of editorial work, plant newspapers should also adopt the principle characteristic of the activities most party press organs, i.e., make editors of such newspapers members of party committees. If an editor, the author emphasizes, is not worthy of being a member of the party committee by virtue of his practical and moral qualities, could he be kept as an editor?

As far as the search for approaches to general methodological problems of ideological work is concerned, let us

cite as an example several excerpts from the manuscript by N. Grigoryev, director of the Krivoy Rog Branch of the University of Marxism-Leninism, entitled "Party-Mindedness: Psychological Aspect." "The essence of the educational process," he writes, "is for the psychological mechanism which governs instinct, reflexes and emotions to work efficiently, so that in the course of his life the person is guided by lofty social ideals and can surmount negative impulses. We describe this as the mechanism of willpower and communist standards. Party history is familiar with many names of people who have properly managed the mechanism of mental control. They are the flower of the party and its pride and the generators of its strength.... Nonetheless, not every party member can be described as the bearer of revolutionary willpower and high standards. In our society and, unfortunately, in the party a "psychological anarchy" has become widespread. This is a phenomenon characteristic of the bourgeois way of life. The nature of the 'psychological anarchy' is the inability and unwillingness to control emotions, lack of understanding of the need to hold them in check and justification of any lack of restraint and the separation of the will from the standard...."

In considering manifestations of subjectivism in which, according to the author, "psychological anarchy" plays the prime role, N. Grigoryev draws the conclusion that the actions of the CPSU Central Committee aimed at asserting and intensifying democratic methods of social management are, unquestionably, necessary. Democracy can successfully counter any aspect of subjectivism. However, we must make more active use of other means of struggle against uncontrolled feelings if they distort social practices. According to him, in this case secondary schools and VUZs could and should do a great deal. In a more narrow area, he notes, the task has also developed of upgrading the psychological standards of the elected party aktiv.

We believe that these excerpts of the editorial mail enable us to determine the increased interest shown by the journal's readers in the tangible interpretation of processes and phenomena which, until very recently, were considered almost banned for discussion or to be analyzed only by "ex-officio" specialists. Our readers are practically unanimous in discussing the spiritual upsurge and the desire for qualitative and persistent work, which are characteristic today of many Soviet people. For example, here is what writes V. Borisov, a driver at the Kuybyshevenko Motor Vehicle Base (Kuybyshev): "Throughout my entire conscious life I waited for an event such as the 27th Party Congress. I am grateful to the party for giving me in my old age the opportunity of being myself, of standing up at a meeting and saying whatever I may be thinking and then to describe it to you in writing...."

This is a detailed and critical letter, quoting a number of accurate observations and examples. Its main topic cannot be determined immediately. It rather pertains to

our life, as seen by a working person. However, V. Borisov does not limit himself to general considerations: his letter includes a program consisting of several items which, in that author's view, would help to promote restructuring in transportation and all other areas. Let us cite a few among them: "....We must finally solve the question of passenger transportation on unrated routes (to the benefit both of the people and the state). We must check with the USSR Ministry of Health and radically solve the question of admissible driver loads. We must organize a technical aid service for drivers along scheduled routes, regardless of the departmental affiliation of the vehicle. Along the routes we must build hotels, cafeterias and roofed stops. We must draft a regulation on responsibility for caring for the equipment, particularly the motor vehicles (toward which we show a barbaric attitude). All those who influence the spiritual upsurge of the working people—writers, composers, actors, philosophers and economists—must launch a campaign in the labor collectives (which are the cutting edge of restructuring and where simple slogans would not enhance the mood of the people). The entire revolutionary mass must take up the fight against the bureaucrat (posters and the press call for 'fight drunkenness!', 'fight waste-makers!' 'fight parasites!' but where is the bureaucrat in all this? For the time being he has not been given battle such as to defeat him completely)..."

Perhaps some of these suggestions may seem naive and others may need a certain correction, refining, etc. However, do they not prove equally simply and eloquently who has, how and why have people totally accepted the ideas of restructuring and totally trusted the party in one of its greatest initiatives? To maintain this noble fire and to channel its energy into the necessary direction is the most important duty of the party organizations. However, as dozens of letters to the journal have emphasized, obviously mere wish is insufficient. In the second stage of restructuring society needs action, action above all, like the air it breathes.

#### **Cadres: Test by Restructuring**

Restructuring in the country is growing and intensifying. This is convincingly proved as a whole by the journal's mail, for in all social strata an understanding is developing of the impossibility of living and working as in the past and of the urgent need for profound changes. "No sensible person can fail to see today the real results of restructuring," writes Professor V. Ostrovskiy, doctor of historical sciences (Saratov). "They are noticeable in the activities of party and state agencies which, as a whole, are persistently spreading the use of democratic principles in their work. However, substantial difficulties remain along their way. Democratization and glasnost are opposed by those who fear to lose their leading position which they do not occupy by right; those who benefit from undeserved advantages and unearned rubles; those who have abandoned the honesty and dignity of communists for the 'will-o'-the-wisp' of careerism, time serving and legitimized Oblomovism. Another

hindrance is the heavy burden of the past. Despite the change of generations, many of us have inherited a 'historical memory' and fear of free thought, because of which discussions, debates and personal opinions were fiercely blocked. The situation today has changed radically, but the fear of 'something which may happen' remains, triggering political infantilism and passiveness...."

We believe that these thoughts contain a great deal of truth. The moment the concept of restructuring and acceleration, which was formulated by the party in the post-April period, began to be systematically implemented through hundreds and thousands of actual actions and to reach every person and test in practice his life stance, contradictions between the new and the old, between the requirements of revolutionary creativity, constructive initiative and conservatism, and inertia and selfish interests became increasingly clear. We saw that the use of cost accounting, state inspection, struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, strengthening order and discipline and other initiatives aimed at the renovation and qualitative improvement of our life, must follow the path of surmounting the inertia of tranquillity, group egotism, etc. Frequently the confrontation between the past and the present assumes the nature of a grave interpersonality conflict.

Such clashes, cases of administrative arbitrariness, persecution for criticism and many other components of the obstruction mechanism are reported and discussed by G. Mizin (Leningrad), V. Serebrennikov (Susumanskiy Rayon, Magadan Oblast), B. Bodnar (Sayanogorsk, Krasnoyarsk Krai), A. Kudrya (Pobedino Village, Sakhalin Oblast), S. Korkina (Agirish Village, Tyumen Oblast), L. Korkoreva (Zherdevka, Tambov Oblast), V. Popov (Mikhaylovka Village, Maritime Krai), Ye. Koloskova (Tula), M. Mikhaylova (Moscow), N. Kondratyeva (Koyelga Village, Chelyabinsk Oblast), A. Kotik (Vostretsov Village, Maritime Krai), A. Zub (Yalta), L. Spivak (Yoshkar-Ola) and others.

Obviously, many of our readers have turned to the journal at a difficult time in their lives, when their thoughts and feelings can by no means be considered calm. That is why some exaggerations in assessments and facts are possible. Nor is it excluded that an investigation or an objective study of each of the stories told to the editors may determine a more complex interaction among forces participating in the clash of various positions and respective actions or that the authors of such letters were mistaken. Nonetheless, as a whole, this mail presents as quite typical, regardless of geographic locale and real circumstances, a pattern of conflict between initiative and sluggishness, decency and lack of principles, and the new and the old.

Invariably, this conflict begins with an action which conflicts with the stagnating atmosphere of a labor collective or its party organization ("last July a person who, as it soon became clear, was far from understanding

the nature of restructuring was appointed chief technologist of our department. He began to set up his own 'team' on the basis of group egotism, or the principle of 'you scratch my back and I will scratch yours.' I decided to have a frank talk with him on the corrupting influence which his behavior was having on the collective. After I realized that the result was nil, I spoke out at a meeting..."). After that, as a rule, an effort is made to bring the "trouble maker" to his senses, to which purpose a great variety of means are used ranging from exhortations to gross pressure ("in the presence of the party bureau secretary the shop chief said that but for my 'trouble making' character I would have been promoted this very year..."). If the "stubborn person" continues to persist other means are used to defame him, to "punish" him for imaginary infractions and to prompt him to resign "of his own free will," which is the most painless variant ("...at a party meeting, after the results of the investigation by the state inspectors were discussed, I, an expert physician at the shop for primary meat processing, was punished. Yet the defects had taken place in operations which followed the primary technological processing, as was mentioned by the party members at the meeting and been enumerated by the state inspector in his document. However, it was I who was reprimanded, for this makes it easier to expel me from the combine." "In order to get rid of me a 'reorganization' was carried out: three departments were combined into one. I was transferred to a position which paid 45 rubles less than what I was earning. As a specialist in the scientific organization of labor, I clearly saw that these 'steps' were not administrative but 'personal.' An associate who was on my side was dismissed 'because of personnel reduction' although new personnel were hired by the newly established department. The chief engineer, who had also criticized the management, was undeservedly given two reprimands."...).

Yes, the party is confident that the situation in the country is based and will continue to be based on the extensive support of restructuring by the working people and a profound understanding of the need for change. However, as was pointed out at the ceremony on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, it would be wrong not to see a certain increase in the opposition of conservative forces which consider restructuring a threat to their selfish interests and objectives. This is manifested not only in managerial units but in labor collectives as well.

Practical experience indicates that frequently party bureau and party committee secretaries who have failed to show principle-mindedness and who have subordinated their actions to the will and gross pressure of excessively zealous administrators, frequently play an active role in helping the forces of inertia and sluggishness and various groups. But where is the elective aktiv, the rank-and-file party members? Does the party bureau, party committee or the party organization as a whole consist exclusively of toadies and turncoats?

These are difficult, very difficult questions to answer. In our view, the answer should be sought in our pre-April past, in the negative phenomena which took decades to develop and whose painful effect influenced all areas of social life, including the party. This was most openly discussed in the documents of the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee plenums. Unquestionably, the situation is influenced by the inertia of administrative-command management which was established in the economy as early as the 1930s and which, reaching the superstructural areas, greatly distorted the democratic principles of socialism and created the respective and then prevalent type of worker, including the party personnel. The old way of thinking and the custom of living in peace and tranquillity, ignoring the vital interests of those around us, will not surrender their positions without a fight. That is why all of us, communists and nonparty people, must arm ourselves with a revolutionary firmness, endurance and courage. We must have the will to act and be optimistic. This is because both the time and the efforts of the party and the people irreversibly work for restructuring.

In this connection, let us mention a few letters in which the comrades raise the question of setting up restructuring committees, buros and commissions. For example, B. Koltsov (Ryazan Oblast) imagines such agencies as follows: "Restructuring committees will be created in all enterprises, farms and establishments on the initiative of the party organizations. Anyone could be a candidate but it would be the business of the collective to decide at general meetings whether the person is suited or not. Such committees will be given extensive rights for a specific term. The administration would be accountable to the committee. An efficient program for restructuring would be formulated. The committee would act firmly and principle-mindedly, lifting all obstacles on the way to change." In the view of V. Kondruk (Vladivostok), the special restructuring commissions should include no more than five party members who are directly accountable to the CPSU Central Committee. It would be desirable to staff them not with local personnel but with "people from other parts of the country." L. Maksimov, S. Kutsenko and S. Solovyev consider as a prerequisite for success "setting up a restructuring bureau of the labor collective, of which the primary party organization would become the nucleus," and suggest that such bureaus include the position of "sociologist-methodologist, who will provide scientific-methodological guidance,...and will not only call for restructuring but actually show how to do it."

What can we say on the subject of such suggestions? Unquestionably, their authors are motivated by the best intentions. They sharply feel the crucial nature of our time and obviously have the warm desire to see sooner and to feel more tangibly the results of restructuring. The reasons motivating them to formulate and support such demands are understandable. However, understanding does not mean accepting or agreeing with them. What concerns us most is that, judging by the letters, a certain

percentage of party members are still not seeing in their elected authorities a real support in the renovation processes and, obviously, do not trust their ability to head this tremendously complex and responsible project. The foundation of the suggestions on setting up special authorities to head restructuring reveals the old and very durable illusion that some sort of "representatives" acting in the center know and can do more than the "rank-and-file" and "local" personnel and that it is worth setting up a new authority which, furthermore, would be described as "extraordinary" and everything would start running smoothly.

M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Goes On," formulated the dual approach in fighting the forces of inertia. First, we must learn how to recognize, identify and neutralize the maneuvers of the opponents of restructuring; second, we must not yield to the pressure of those who are unwilling to consider the objective logic of restructuring and who express their dissatisfaction with the allegedly slow pace of change, who would like to skip stages and try to accomplish everything in one fell swoop. Restructuring, as has been repeatedly emphasized in party documents, will become irreversible only when it becomes the personal, the deeply felt matter for everyone. To expose and to analyze contradictions, to understand their nature and, on this basis, to structure the system of all measures which must be taken is now the only possible approach to the matter. The available power for the implementation of our tasks is tremendous. It is the potential of the party's influence on restructuring. Harnessing it fully, upgrading the combativeness of one's organization and personally assuming an active stance in restructuring are the most important objectives of any party member, whatever his job may be!

Currently the party is actively preparing for its 19th All-Union Conference. Reports submitted by party authorities on guiding restructuring are being discussed collectively at meetings and plenums, and ways of solving this exceptionally important task to the fate of developing socialism are being earmarked. The CPSU Central Committee conference on the tasks of the party in ensuring the main trends in the new stage of restructuring stipulated as the main objective of the comprehensive collective search which is taking place: to be in the vanguard and to work in a new fashion.

The editors of KOMMUNIST intend systematically to cover the course of this search. We invite to this effect the participation of the elected party aktiv, social scientists and all our readers, communists and nonparty members alike, to express their opinion on a wide range of problems of party building and on ways of democratizing the party and society.

In starting a roundtable by correspondence with this survey of KOMMUNIST editorial mail, the editors suggests to its participants to concentrate above all on the following three questions:



What improvements must be made in the practice of accepting new members in the ranks of the CPSU, educating the party members, and helping every party member to become an active fighter for restructuring and an active participant in the renovation of socialism?

How can we tangibly upgrade the combativeness of the primary party organizations and truly turn them into the political nuclei of labor collectives?

What type of mechanism would reliably ensure the systematic development of intraparty democracy, criticism, self-criticism, glasnost, strengthening of party discipline and strict observance of collective leadership in the work of elected party organs on all levels and individual responsibility for assignments?

How to ensure the systematic implementation of CPSU cadre policy and what are the reserves, ways and means of improving work with cadres?

What does it mean for the CPSU to be the political vanguard of society under contemporary conditions; what are today the practical foundations and specific forms for building the interrelationship between the party and the state and the party and the other public organizations?

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### Entering the New Times

18020006e Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 44-49

[Article by Valeriy Gennadiyevich Bushuyev and Nikita Ivanovich Maslennikov, KOMMUNIST associates; report on a discussion in the interest of peace and cooperation]

[Text] The history of the worker and communist and of democratic and antiwar movements is familiar with a great variety of forms and levels of contacts and interactions. Bilateral meetings, regional and international colloquiums, symposia, conferences and congresses have long become standard practices in global contacts.

However, even with such a rich and varied historical background the meeting of representatives of parties and movements which were in Moscow for the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution stands out sharply in terms of composition and nature and the extremely broad range and significance of the questions it raised.

The 178 delegations from 120 countries, which met on 4-5 November 1987 in the Soviet capital, represented the virtually entire spectrum of left-wing, democratic and peace-loving forces on earth. It is difficult to think of any

other example in which, within the same hall, leaders and noted personalities of the communists, socialist, social democratic, labor, revolutionary-democratic and national-liberation parties and movements worked side-by-side.

The people who assembled here had no predetermined agenda. Nor was there any kind of keynote report followed by debates around it, a communique or a resolution. There was no ostentatious unanimity and the "arrogance of omniscience," which would reject any other viewpoint. What took place at the meeting was an entirely open dialogue, unrestrained by any "diplomatic" or protocol rules. It was open, sharp and involved. It was interested not in someone's efforts to assert some truth or to have the accuracy of one's own approach or evaluation of a phenomenon acknowledged, or gain any kind of advantage, but in the joint search for answers to vital problems which tolerated no postponement, problems shared by all mankind, common to our earthly home.

Both the participants in the meeting and the authors of the numerous comments published in the world press on its proceedings noted and are continuing to note the unique nature of this forum, pointing out the atmosphere of sincerity and democracy which prevailed here, the desire for reciprocal understanding and the fruitfulness of the exchange of views. The meeting showed that despite differences in views and positions held by the participants in the meeting, they were united by something greater. All the parties and movements represented in it, speaking out for the working people in their own countries, expressed their understanding of the dangers of the situation which had developed in the world and their readiness to do everything possible to achieve the main thing: to remove the threat of war and to improve international relations.

However, let future researchers determine the role which this meeting will play in the history of the universal struggle against the threat of nuclear annihilation and in unifying the progressive, democratic and right-thinking forces on earth. It is clear today that this meeting drew the very close attention of the broad public throughout the earth, proving the major potential possibilities of dialogue and cooperation among communist, worker, revolutionary-democratic and labor parties, mass democratic organizations and movements for the sake of removing the threat of war and solving other problems affecting mankind.

It is already clear that the meeting helped all of its participants not simply to make public their views on the world and the crucial problems of the contemporary stage in social development and not only to compare their own views and forecasts with other possibly quite different ones, but also to sum up the results of the exchange of experience, to formulate new initiatives and to draw the necessary conclusions for the future. The materials of the discussion give food for further thought



and searching in the spirit of a creative study of the world in which we live and the new role in this world which left-wing, progressive and democratic forces must play.

"The meeting," noted V. Penco, a senator representing the Uruguayan Broad Front, a participant in the meeting, "proved that in such a crucial time as the present political parties and social organizations which hold different philosophical concepts could coordinate their positions in the area of defending peace and the need for coexistence."

What are the objective factors which urgently required and, at the same time, made possible the holding of such an informal dialogue in Moscow? And what are the main ideas in the discussion of which its participants proved the existence of a similarity or coincidence of approaches and evaluations and earmarked possibilities of joint action?

In itself, the idea of uniting the human species in the face of a monstrous anomaly such as war is by no means new. However, all the efforts to find ways to eternal peace have essentially remained nothing but utopian dreams until the proletariat, profoundly interested in safeguarding peace and in the international unity of working people, emerged in the arena of historical creativity.

The qualitative leap in the antiwar struggle, as noted by many of its participants, became possible only after the victory of the Great October Revolution. From the very first days of its existence, the Soviet state openly proclaimed that henceforth problems related to the struggle for peace and halting the bloody slaughter unleashed by imperialism should become the concern not only of governments but, above all, of the people's masses themselves. In October 1917, in his speech on peace at the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, V.I. Lenin asked to "help the nations intervene in problems of war and peace" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.* [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 16).

Today hundreds of millions of people have been given the opportunity truly to influence political life on earth. The activities of the broad people's masses on the proscenium of history are also the foundations for a shifting of peaceful coexistence from the political and diplomatic areas to the area of the fundamental laws governing international relations in our age. This substantial enrichment of the idea of peaceful coexistence, currently materialized in the principles of the new international order, is the result of changes in the qualitative definition of our world which is undergoing a crucial period of development.

The problem of the survival of mankind and the comprehensive nature of the scientific and technical revolution, the process of increased complexity and growth of economic relations it stimulates, the increased interdependence among countries and nations, the essentially

new role played by communications and information media, the increased common threat to the ecology, the crying problems of underdevelopment and the aggravation of other global problems which are challenging the very capability of man to adapt to the dynamics of contemporary life are the main components of the changing qualitative characteristics of the world and its integral development under circumstances governed by variety and contradictoriness.

The changes which are taking place in the nature of global developments are so vast that they demand the reinterpretation of many customary concepts and the summation of the mass of new facts and phenomena and of the experience gained in the revolutionary struggle. Reality itself forces us to consider, on the basis of the new way of thinking, that which only yesterday seems inviolable and absolutely clear.

The reality of our time is such that as a result of the intensification of interdependence the global consequences of the actions of any country in any area of social development without exception have drastically increased and reached a qualitatively new standard. Under these circumstances, priority is given to a set of contradictions between the objective possibilities of mankind to establish reliable and sensible control over said consequences, on the one hand, and the lack in international relations of an efficient mechanism and of means and agreements for survival in an interrelated world, on the other.

This makes urgent the task of organizing a universal dialogue, free from confrontation and aimed at finding points of contact along the entire system of global problems and in all complex clusters and problems of contemporary global development. Purposeful work in this direction means bringing into action the mechanism of self-preservation of mankind and contributing to the increased potential of peace, reason and good will. This cannot be achieved without both masses and political leaders mastering the new way of thinking, which is aimed at making every person, while remaining a citizen of his own country, member of his party and activist in any progressive national movement, also imbued with the responsibility for the condition of the entire world and for whether there would be any world at all.

Outside of live contacts, not only with like-minded people, but also with people of different philosophical and political persuasions, the new way of thinking would be simply unviable. It is precisely in the course of a dialogue with political forces representing the entire variety of the contemporary world that we can test both our own possibility of practicing a new way of thinking, as well as the realism of the political actions this dictates. The rejection by any country of the intellectual potential of other countries and nations and of all progressive and political parties and movements leads directly to national limitations in politics.

The Moscow meeting was the most important example in international practice, stemming from the very logic and content of the new way of thinking. In the course of the constructive debate which developed, the gravity, the critical nature of the times experienced by mankind were virtually unanimously acknowledged. "We shall either unite our efforts before the missiles have been launched or it would be too late. This is the main significance of our time and, hence, the responsibility of the participants in our meeting." This statement by P. Simon, secretary general of the Australian Socialist Party, reflected the moods and thoughts of the participants in the forum.

Today the difficult task of rejecting the usual patterns and stereotypes of thinking and assessing the entire comprehensiveness, variety and dynamism of the world around us and its conflicting trends and acute contradictions in a new, sober and realistic manner, has faced in its entire magnitude the forces which must, by the very course of social development, ensure the survival and immortality of mankind on earth. The variety of opinions expressed in the course of the meeting show the progress made by the fundamental idea of the interdependence of the world, reflecting the entire dialectics of contemporary development.

The most important consequence of such a developing global integrity was the appearance and aggravation of global problems, which are common to and identical for all nations. Whatever the topic may be, whether conservation, the critical condition of the environment and the air basin and the oceans, the by no means infinite resources of the planet, the calamities and suffering of broad masses in vast areas on earth and, above all, preserving life on the planet from the total destruction caused by a nuclear conflagration, all speakers at the meetings emphasized their vital importance to the fate of civilization.

"Today," T. Zhivkov, BCP Central Committee general secretary, noted in his address, "it is clearer than ever before that the air we breathe is common; the water we drink is the same for all; the land which feeds us, is one. Never has the threat to these goods shared by all humanity been so real and so great."

Nor did the participants in the meeting ignore vital problems of a global nature, such as the hunger and poverty of hundreds of millions of people, the economic backwardness and huge foreign debts of the developing countries, which are suffering from an unfair nonequivalent trade caused by the international economic order. "The problem of the foreign debt of any developing country is today insoluble," said J.E. Dos Santos, chairman of the NPLA-Labor Party (Angola) at the meeting. "There is virtually no country that can pay it and, in a number of cases, the sum total of the debt is so high as to block socioeconomic development." The participants in the meeting drew attention to the close interconnection between foreign indebtedness and the arms race

unleashed by the fault of imperialism. Every year about \$1 trillion is spent in the world on armaments, said L. de Pansec, secretary in charge of international problems, French Socialist Party, equaling the overall indebtedness of Third World countries.

The problem of regional conflicts is exceptionally grave in the contemporary world. Data were cited at the meeting, according to which in the past 40 years more than 100 regional conflicts, with more than 20 million human casualties, had broken out in various parts of the earth. "Despite their local or regional scale, such conflicts have nonetheless threatened and are threatening peace the world over, seriously destabilizing intergovernmental relations," said A. Yata, secretary general of the Moroccan Progress and Socialism Party. It is impossible to eliminate the threat of war and make the powder keg of regional conflicts safe without rejecting the old efforts to command the world and to impose one's values and way of life on others and without respecting the sovereign right of each nation to make its own social choice.

Peace on all continents is a powerful incentive also in surmounting economic backwardness and underdevelopment, delegates to the meeting said. "It is impossible to conceive of development without peace and disarmament," emphasized Fidel Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee. "And to think of a world without development would be unrealistic."

No single country, however rich and technically developed it may be, can deal with global problems alone. In itself, this is yet another convincing proof of the need to rally the efforts of mankind for the sake of its preservation. Today progress in human civilization simply has no meaning outside the solution of global problems. The very logic of history leads the peoples on earth to become aware of the urgency of ensuring their practical solution. Without this, our common future would be inconceivable.

Such a conclusion is entirely natural to socialism, for it proceeds from the very nature of the new social system for which specific class interests and the interests of mankind are one and the same.

Naturally, life itself will prove whether the capitalist system can do without militarism and neocolonialism and adapt itself to the conditions of a nuclear-free and disarmed world, and to a new and just economic order and honest competition between the values of the two worlds. As of now, however, it is already becoming clear that it is the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the need to ensure a safe nuclear energy and to surmount economic prices that are objectively pushing capitalism to the adoption of such a stance. It is also encouraging along this way by increasing obviousness of the catastrophic consequences of a supermilitarization of the economy and the growing threat of a social collapse in the developing countries unless they are ensured an equal status in

global economic relations and unless we begin to implement the ideas of a new world economic order and to convert to the practical level the solution of the problem of "disarmament for the sake of development." Capitalism is encouraged along this direction also by the processes which are taking place in the socialist part of the planet: the profound social changes which were initiated in the Soviet Union broaden and strengthen in a decisive fashion the material base for the creation of a comprehensive system of peace and international security. The development of the class struggle and other manifestations of social contradictions in the capitalist countries, the growing material and spiritual self-discrediting of the exploiting society and the enhancement of anti-imperialist moods among the broad masses of the earth's population, clearly reflected in the speeches of the participants in the meeting, are also tremendously influencing the objective processes in favor of peace.

As was noted at the meeting, life could force the bourgeoisie, including the monopoly bourgeoisie, to take into consideration realities and to realize that all of us are in the same boat and that we must behave in such a way as not to overturn it. Under the circumstances of the nuclear age no other sensible way than coexistence and peaceful competition exists for capitalism as well.

In itself, the formulation of the question of the need for a new political thinking, and the discussion on this subject which developed in the wide circles of the international public, as was noted in a number of speeches by the participants in the meeting, are greatly weakening the efforts of imperialism to continue to impose upon the popular masses the "image of the enemy," to disseminate myths of the "Soviet menace" and to justify with them its interventionist and neoglobulist policy. "The deep awareness of the responsibility for the fate of one's nation and the future of mankind is the line of demarcation separating the new thinking, on the one hand, and the hegemonistic egotism of imperialism, on the other," said M. Magallona, secretary general of the Philippine Communist Party Central Committee.

Based on Lenin's idea of the priority of the interest of social development, starting with the April Central Committee Plenum, the CPSU has been systematically taking steps toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. Even our ideological opponents find it difficult to deny the fact which has become clear to the nations: the entire behavior of the Soviet Union in the international arena and all of its foreign policy initiatives have been imbued with an aspiration for dialogue and cooperation, honest and frank talks and respect for the autonomy and sovereign right of nations to make their own political and social choice.

Suggestions on developing a comprehensive system of international security, formulated by the Soviet Union and supported by the peace-loving public on earth, offer unique opportunities for cooperation among all countries and

nations and for extensive initiatives launched by progressive and democratic forces. The implementation of this idea, which confirms the increased awareness of mankind of its own destiny, would provide opportunities for a closer and more productive cooperation among parties, governments and public organizations and movements which are sincerely concerned with the fate of peace on earth. Laying the foundations of this system, which extends to the military, political, economic and humanitarian areas, would enable us to eliminate in fact the threat of war, improve international relations and restructure them democratically on the basis of humanitarian and civilized principles worthy of man.

The participants in the meeting expressed the hope that the Soviet-American Washington summit and the conclusion of agreements on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles would lead to an agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive armaments, honoring the stipulations of the ABM Treaty, and mark the start of reducing international tension and creating a suitable climate for reaching just and balanced political solutions to explosive regional problems. "...Starting with 7 December, the disarmament process must become irreversible," K.A. Nielsen, chairman of the Norwegian Communist Party, said.

The following idea was frequently expressed in the speeches at the meeting: All of us stand at the sources of the most important process, the idea of comprehensive security which, having conquered the masses in the full meaning of the term on the planetary level, is becoming a material force equal to the objective factors of global development. A common vector which consists of parallel and joint actions among all international leftist forces is developing in the course of the reciprocal building of a comprehensive and indivisible security for all and the shaping of a general line in the solution of the global problems of our home on earth.

It is entirely natural that the peaceful and far-reaching initiatives of the Soviet Union, which are consistent with the basic interests of mankind, have met with a deep response among various political trends in virtually all countries. It is equally natural that the greatest response was that of the global labor movement and the progressive social movements which have proclaimed their resolve to struggle for peace and for the solution of the global problems of our time. This reasserted the fact that, as in the past, the working people play a special role in the common front of hundreds of millions of people who today oppose the warmongers. Despite all the changes it has experienced, the contemporary working class, within its present social boundaries remains the main character in the preservation and upward development of civilization.

The increased international responsibility of the progressive forces of our time for the destinies of mankind and its survival formulates tasks of unparalleled difficulty

and scale for the communist movement. Who if not the communists, who are by their very nature not only a national but also an international force, has been called upon to pioneer a new political thinking? Who if not the communists, the heirs and perpetuators of the great traditions of liberation and humanism in the past, can dialectically combine in their ideology and politics class with universal values? Who if not the communists, who have had the honor of becoming the core of the broad social coalitions and political institutions, the purpose of which is to stimulate and rally the efforts of all mankind, can solve the global problems of our time?

As the addresses by the participants at the meeting indicated, the labor movement and the other progressive movements in dozens of countries have become fully aware of their responsibility in the face of the new problems and the deep concern shown by the broad toiling masses. The discussion of the ways of solving interdependently the huge complex of specific contradictions which have developed in the world also indicated that it is only by eliminating their confrontational and semi-confrontational forms and solutions of global problems that could, under contemporary conditions, raise the standards of activities of the labor and communist movements themselves.

"We believe," said O. Son, chairman of the Danish Communist Party, "that our movement does not make full use of its forces and potential and does not adequately meet the requirements of the present." As many other features of the contemporary world, the delegates to the meeting emphasized, the communist movement needs a renovation and quality changes. Naturally, the class struggle and the other manifestations of social contradictions will continue to have a substantial influence on the development of the objective processes on earth. The struggle for national and social liberation was and remains the sacred right of the working people and the nations as a whole. Nor does the ideological confrontation in the international arena lose any of its gravity.

The new situation and the new tasks it assigns to the progressive forces, the participants in the meeting said, do not harm in the least the principles of the class struggle. They do not hinder the resolve of the party members to build a new, a socialist world without exploiters and exploited. However, they must become aware of the new requirements which face today the political vanguard of the working class and the activities of communist parties. Such activities must become truly comprehensive and aimed at involving a wide range of allies both within the individual countries and in the international arena.

No one should have even the slightest doubt that the communists have been and remain convinced of the fact that in the historical future it is precisely socialism, as M.S. Gorbachev said at the meeting, that will "make a decisive contribution to surmounting critical problems which arise in the development of civilization. It is

precisely this system that has the potential of efficiency influencing the search for the type of Hegelian 'yardstick,' the balancing of interests which will enable mankind to reach an essentially new salutary standard." Despite all the difficulties and negative features which paralleled the building and development of socialism, it offered a convincing alternative to capitalism. Its rise to a qualitatively new standard of progress is related by the multi-million strong popular masses to their hope of preventing a nuclear catastrophe and ensuring a better future for the present and future generations.

As was the case during the previous stages in the struggle, today the communists show no inclination to nurture illusions concerning the smooth course of the historical process. This process has never been nor could be simple and direct. However, the duration, novelty and unevenness of the social revolution which is developing on a universal scale and is assuming a great variety of forms, combined with a coexistence among progressive shifts, roll-backs, changes and interconnections between revolutionary and evolutionary processes do not change the overall trend of development. The course of the most profound social renovation which is continuing in the contemporary world only makes unviable the logical systems based on the old textbooks, inevitably dooming to failure efforts to assess our contemporaneity with the help of postulates which were developed in the 1960s, the 1950s or even the 1930s. This urgently calls for the adoption of new approaches, for the reinterpretation of many problems of ideology, politics, strategy and tactics of the communist movement and other progressive forces of our time. As was noted at the meeting, a reinterpretation of the theoretical legacy created by our predecessors in the struggle for the social liberation of mankind is needed, a reinterpretation which will enable us to make an accurate study of the new realities and draw proper political conclusions consistent with them.

As to the Soviet communists, as was emphasized at the meeting, our party has surmounted the attempts which had taken place in the past of playing tricks with history and proceeding, as sometimes happen, not from what is but from what we would like to see. The restructuring, which developed in the Soviet Union on the initiative of the CPSU, put an end to such efforts at self-deception, at lulling ourselves with the help of customary formulas and cliches which block the way to the objective study of many real phenomena and processes within the country and in the rest of the world.

Each new success achieved by the Soviet Union in the democratization of social life, upgrading the well-being of the Soviet people, implementing a radical economic reform and surmounting the technological lagging behind the developed capitalist countries, means not only a faster progress made by our country on the path opened by the October Revolution, and not only the further enrichment of the values of socialism, the fuller identification of its advantages and its liberation from anything which distorted the profoundly humanistic

aspect of our system. It also means, as was noted in the meeting, success for the entire worker and communist movements, and an additional substantial contribution by the USSR to the strengthening and growth of the international reputation of the forces of socialism, democracy and progress.

"Like the word 'soviet,' which symbolizes 1917, the word 'restructuring' has entered all languages and needs no translation," said the British communist B. Ranelson, who attended the meeting, in a talk with the authors of these lines. "As was the case with the October Revolution in its time, your present revolutionary reforms are meeting with a wide response not only among the Soviet people but throughout the rest of the world. As in 1917, the toiling and progressive forces on earth will remain loyal to the principles of international cohesion. Their distinguishing features today include strengthening the peace movement and creating a universal movement in support of disarmament. This is of vital importance to all of us. It is of vital importance to achieving the tremendous objective you have set. Your successes will not only qualitatively enhance the living standards of the Soviet people but are also a step forward in the process initiated in 1917, the process of the transformation of the world in which we live. This requires, above all, to eliminate the threat of war."

The following thought was repeatedly expressed at the meeting: The time has come to organize close interaction among all progressive forces in the world, under contemporary forms, naturally, and to set a more advanced standard for their reciprocal relations, and promote internationalist actions and internationalist cohesion of a new type: the unification of all international forces of peace, democracy and social progress for a constructive joint creativity for the sake of the survival of mankind.

One of the most important achievements of the meeting was precisely the fact that it openly and most loudly spoke out in favor of cooperation and for a joint search for a humane alternative to the antagonistic society and the stress of confrontation in the world arena not only by the fraternal communist and worker parties but also the revolutionary- democratic and socialist, social democratic and labor parties, and mass democratic organizations and movements.

By reflecting the variety of the world and the various conditions under which each party and movement operates and, thereby, the characteristics of their ideological positions and approaches, the meeting proved in practice that a constructive interaction is possible among them, along with an open, respectful comradely dialogue in which no one wins and no one loses anything but, conversely, everyone benefits a great deal. Such a dialogue proved that a new situation is developing in the international worker, democratic and progressive movements, and new ways and prospects for joint cohesive activity appear.

Naturally, their maximally full utilization is by no means a simple matter. Reaching a new standard of reciprocal relations will inevitably suffer birth pains and carry the birthmarks of the difficult past and of various types of "infant diseases" of growth.

The main thing, however, is that a creative and fruitful dialogue among international left forces, above all among the main detachments of the labor movement, has been started. In a certain sense this marks the advent of a new historical period. This was the main result of the meeting, which was of equal interest to all of its participants. Each party and movement which sent its representatives to the meeting will draw its own specific conclusions in terms of the practices of the revolutionary struggle. This is their sovereign right and responsibility to their own nations.

"Peace cannot be concluded only at the summit. Peace must be promoted from the base." These famous Leninist words remain today the most important political guide to the participants in the antiwar movement, to the forces of socialism, democracy and progress, and to anyone who, under the present inordinately difficult circumstances, is trying to implement the bright and humane dreams of the best members of the preceding generations of mankind for the peace and happiness of the people and the triumph of social justice.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**Revolution Which Changed the Course of History**  
*18020006f Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18,*  
*Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 50-55*

[Article by William Kashtan, secretary general, Canadian Communist Party]

[Text] The world is celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a revolution which changed the course of history. A new society was born, free from exploitation and national oppression, a society which set as its objective to put an end to wars among nations.

That society eliminated unemployment, illiteracy and poverty. The working people in the Soviet Union acquired real rights for which workers in the capitalist world are still fighting.

The Great October Socialist Revolution not only put the working class in power but also proved in practice over the past decades the fact that it can successfully manage a state and a national economy, and create a new culture.

This scattered the myth that capitalism is eternal. The Great October Socialist Revolution proved that capitalism can be replaced by another social system of a higher standard, socialism. It proved that there is an alternative to exploitation and war.

The October Revolution inaugurated a new age not only in the history of Russia. In world history it became a turning point from the old, capitalist, to the new, socialist, world. Capitalism stopped being a system which ruled the world. The chain of world capitalism was broken and can no longer be repaired today.

Having proved the possibility that socialism could win in a single country, the October Revolution was also the first step on the way to the victory of socialism on a global scale. This was confirmed by subsequent events. The triumph of socialism in a number of countries led to the establishment of the world socialist system, which brought about a change in the correlation of forces on earth in favor of peace and progress.

The defense and building of a new society were difficult. From the very first days of its existence, the new system faced the efforts of the imperialists to overthrow it. Canadian forces as well participated in the intervention in the Far East. Imperialism mounted one crusade after another, intervention, civil war, economic blockade, "cordon sanitaire," all sorts of military provocation and constant pressure in order to lead the young state of the working people away from the revolutionary course and to prevent the implementation of its tremendous possibilities and advantages compared with capitalism.

After all such attempts had failed, imperialism used fascism as a weapon for the destruction of socialism. This attempt as well failed. Fascism was routed although the Soviet Union paid a high price for the victory.

After their victory, under the party's leadership, the peoples of the USSR undertook to repair the wreckage of the war years. Imperialism, which did not help the Soviet Union in solving this tremendous problem, mounted against it a war of a different type, a cold war this time. The aggressive NATO bloc was created, of which Canada as well became a part. Nuclear blackmail, the threat of a first nuclear strike, economic pressure and the development and creation of various types of weapons (today this applies to "star wars" weapons) were all used against the Soviet Union in the hope of slowing down the process of the restoration of its national economy and weakening its positions in the world. The Canadian government became an active ally of American imperialism in the cold war against socialism.

It is one of the miracles of our days that despite all these efforts mounted by imperialism and the domestic enemies of socialism, and despite the errors which were made in the course of building socialism, within the shortest possible historical time the USSR was able to become a powerful force in the world. Socialism not only

withstood but also grew from a single socialist country into a global socialist system. The strengthening of the world socialist system was a major factor in the collapse of the colonial system and provided an impetus for the development of the international labor movement.

The imperialist countries have lost their monopoly status in the world. The United States also lost the monopoly of nuclear weapons. The correlation of forces has changed to the detriment of imperialism and in favor of the forces of peace, democracy, independence and socialism. This new correlation of forces and the military-strategic parity which was attained have helped to safeguard peace the world over. The world must be grateful to the Soviet Union for this accomplishment. This also enabled socialism to proclaim that a nuclear world war is not fatally inevitable. Military parity with the United States has cost tremendous funds and forces to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. This led to the establishment of a new situation which the reactionary forces in the United States are vainly trying to change to their advantage.

The historical accomplishments of the global socialist system, the Soviet Union above all, over the past 70 years opened new prospects to mankind. They provided new opportunities in the universal-historical struggle for a transition to socialism without a nuclear war. Socialism and its growing power and systematic struggle for peaceful coexistence have prevented the reactionary forces of American imperialism to lead mankind into a nuclear world war.

In noting the 70th anniversary of the Great Revolution, we particularly single out the systematic struggle for peace, for it is the base of the entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the international activities of the CPSU. One of the first governmental acts of the Soviet system was Lenin's Decree on Peace, which included the fundamental concept of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems.

The concept of peaceful coexistence remains a fixed feature in the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It is indeed true that there is no alternative to peaceful coexistence in our nuclear-space age which, as was emphasized at the 27th CPSU Congress, demands a new way of thinking. The need for a new thinking is determined by the fact that the stockpile of nuclear weapons is sufficient to destroy the entire world. Destruction or survival is the new reality and the real choice in our world. Comrade Gorbachev directly raised this question at the Soviet-American summit, proclaiming on behalf of the Soviet state that "nuclear war must never be unleashed for no one can win it." The only way to solve differences, however grave they may be, is that of peaceful talks rather than war.

In pursuit of this objective, the Soviet Union formulated a number of peace initiatives aimed at the gradual taking of steps which could lead to a nuclear-free world by the

year 2000. The energetic peace initiatives of socialism have made a great impression on the Canadians as they have on the rest of the world, and have influenced public opinion and the antiwar movements. The idea that the Soviet Union is the source of threat of war has been replaced in the opinion of many Canadians by that of the equal responsibility shared by the United States and the USSR concerning international tension and the threat of war. Increasingly, today the Canadians realize that it is precisely the Reagan administration and the military-industrial complex that are the source of the threat of war. Reality confirms this with every passing day. The picture of "threat" allegedly embodied by the Soviet Union, depicted by imperialism, is revealing its fictitiousness with each new peaceful initiative launched by the USSR. What kind of "threat" could the Soviet Union present if it calls for the elimination of nuclear weapons, while imperialism is unwilling to do so? Who is threatening whom?

Socialism and peace are indivisible by virtue of the very nature of socialism and the socialist system. Its very existence and its growing power are preventing the outbreak of a world war. The Soviet Union deserves profound gratitude for its comprehensive and wise policy, peace initiatives and firmness in not responding to provocations and always aspiring to the reaching of the main objective: to help the unification of the peoples of the world in supporting a policy of isolating warmongers and supporters of the cold war and contributing to the progress of the cause of peace. It is precisely socialism and the Soviet Union that offer the change for having a nuclear-free world by the year 2000.

The threat of nuclear war, on the one hand, and the systematic struggle waged by the Soviet Union for peace and disarmament, on the other, played an important role in the development of peace movements in Canada and the establishment of the Canadian Alliance for Peace, which rallies virtually all antiwar forces in the country. They were united in the struggle against the threat of nuclear war which, in our country, is manifested with the demand of converting Canada into a nuclear-free zone, ending the tests of American cruise missiles on Canadian territory, putting an end to nuclear tests and using outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The growing concern created by the military strategy pursued by American imperialism and the intensifying pressure exerted by U.S. imperialism on Canada, combined with concern caused by the economic and military integration between Canada and the United States have all provided a new scale to the struggle for the sovereignty and independence of our country and for the pursuit of its independent foreign policy.

The military integration of Canada with the U.S. empire has gone quite far. The monopoly circles, who represent the interests of military-industrial corporations, are influencing the Mulroney government and the new conservatives, who aspire for an even closer alliance with the

United States. Under the cover of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism, the interests and independence of Canada are being sacrificed to a policy of subordination to the United States. This is confirmed by the extension for another 5 years of the agreement on conducting tests of American cruise missiles. The government has increased its military expenditures. It opposes the freezing of nuclear weapons. The NORAD (Joint Command for the Aerospace Defense of North America) treaty was extended as well for another 5 years. This treaty opens the door to Canada's involvement with the American "star wars" program. American-Canadian airfields are being built in northern Canada. The recently drafted defense "White Paper," which stipulates the spending of \$200 billion over the next 15 years, under the pretext of that same imaginary Soviet military threat, is yet another confirmation of the process of militarization and integration with the United States. The arms race joined by the Mulroney government is leading to the further militarization of the economy and the subordination of Canadian national interests to those of American imperialism. This means a significant increase in the military budget at the expense of social programs and should bring about widespread opposition.

With each new concession made by the Mulroney government yielding to the pressure of American imperialism, the demand for a Canadian independent foreign policy is being increasingly heard. The fact that, as in the past, influential forces in the United States, Canada and other NATO members, are actively opposing any nuclear disarmament can only intensify this demand. Such forces continue to rely on the policy of so-called containment, i.e., the policy of the military fist instead of nuclear disarmament. Their opposition to an agreement conceals the intention to enhance the pursuit of nuclear armaments on earth and in outer space. While talking about peace, these forces are comprehensively aspiring to preventing any possibility of the elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe and throughout the world.

Differences have appeared in Canada among the parties in the monopoly camp on the matter of supporting the foreign policy of the Reagan administration. They reflect contradictions between pro-Canadian and pro-American monopoly circles. However, the pro-Canadian group, whose interests are expressed to a greater extent by the Liberal Party, is displaying inconsistency in defending the independence and sovereignty of Canada and in the struggle for peace and the country's security. Meanwhile, the parliamentary group of the Liberal Party is acting contrary to the party's positions adopted at its congress which called for ending the testing of American cruise missiles in Canada. The struggle on whether the New Democratic Party (a social-democratic party) is becoming aggravated on the subject of whether or not it should continue to oppose Canada's membership in NATO and NORAD. All of these maneuvers which, in addition to everything else, reflect the strong pressure exerted by American imperialism on Canada, indicate the need for the further development of the struggle for peace in our country.



The continuing opposition of Western aggressive circles to an agreement on control over nuclear weapons emphasizes, more than anything else, the need to continue to strengthen the worldwide movement against the nuclear threat. Imperialism must be forced to abandon this dangerous course. Our party has long supported the view that ideological differences among the parties to the dispute should be put on the back burner in the interest of creating a powerful global movement for survival and against the nuclear threat. No one can stand aside from the solution of this urgent problem to which the future of mankind is linked.

The 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution is being celebrated not only under the circumstances of a titanic struggle between the forces of peace and war. It is also being celebrated under the conditions of a turn in the socioeconomic development of the Soviet Union. The present period is no less important than the period of collectivization and industrialization in the 1930s. The successes achieved at that time determined the outcome of the struggle against fascism. The present struggle for restructuring and development, for achieving the objectives set by the 27th Party Congress and for accelerating socioeconomic progress is aimed at strengthening the economy and, at the same time, establishing the ability of socialism to maintain military-strategic parity with imperialism and securing a peace free from nuclear weapons.

The Soviet Union and its people are making efforts of historical proportion to remove the obstacles which hinder the implementation of the program of acceleration and to use the scientific and technical revolution for the good of socialism. The doubling of the Soviet production potential by the year 2000 will not only enhance the living standard of the people but will also, at the same time, prove the advantages of socialism in peaceful competition with capitalism.

Glasnost and the expansion of socialist democracy are inseparable from such objectives. They are absolutely necessary for achieving them and their purpose is to give a new impetus to the all-round progress of socialism.

The words "glasnost" and "perestroyka" have been adopted in the ordinary vocabulary in the capitalist world without the need for translation.

Today the working people link socialism to openness, dynamism and the further development of democracy. The changes which became possible in the Soviet Union thanks to this will, unquestionably, have a deep impact on the thinking of the working people the world over, including Canada, and particularly on Canadians with socialist leanings, who consider socialism a viable alternative to capitalism which is torn by a crisis. We see as our most important task to popularize the changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

These changes coincide in time with a sharper and more profound criticism of capitalism and of its inability to act in the interests of the people.

The contrasts between capitalism and socialism are becoming increasingly sharper and clearer. Socialism is formulating a strategy of growth and development and is setting itself new objectives, whereas state-monopoly capitalism holds on to the strategy of strict savings, in any case, at the expense of the people. The time when state-monopoly capitalism called for the creation of jobs and a social security system has been replaced by a time of a new offensive mounted against the living standard, a time of constant mass unemployment, the dismantling of social gains, which is aimed at lowering the living standard of the working people, and an attack on the rights of the trade unions. Today the capitalist world is the embodiment of homelessness and unemployment.

The time will come when the Soviet people will have the shortest working day and the highest living standard in the world. These and other accomplishments will enhance the attractiveness of socialism and will prove its advantages most specifically. The attractiveness of socialism and Marxism-Leninism will increase, winning over more millions of people to the side of scientific socialism.

It has been well put that although socialism is a reality it is still not an ideal society free from shortcomings. This is consistent with M.S. Gorbachev's statement to the effect that the socialist revolution opens the way to all-round social progress without, however, automatically guaranteeing it. A steady updating of socialism is necessary, for otherwise blood clots may appear in the social circulation and economic and social problems could reach dangerous proportions. Such shortcomings do not stem from the nature of socialism but are caused by objective conditions, including international tension, which is being deliberately increased by imperialism for the sake of forcing socialism to "sweat it out," to exhaust it and to hinder the display of its advantages over capitalism. This is the purpose of increasing the arms race which imperialism refuses to end, declining suggestions which would lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons on earth and preventing their deployment in outer space.

Imperialism would like to prevent the Soviet Union from implementing its plan for doubling its production potential by the year 2000. It would like to prevent socialism from proving, not as an ideal but in reality and to the fullest extent its advantages under conditions of peaceful competition with capitalism.

While the working people are following with increasing interest the new processes in the Soviet Union, imperialism is doing everything possible to force the working people to draw negative conclusions from the process of restructuring taking place in the USSR. It is being claimed that socialism and Marxism-Leninism are

undergoing a crisis, that restructuring in the Soviet Union indicates that socialism does not work and that Marxism-Leninism has become obsolete. Glasnost and the broadening of socialist democracy are interpreted by some in the sense that as a political system socialism is breaking down and capitalism is being restored in the Soviet Union.

Since 1917 the ideologues of capitalism have been writing about the crisis of socialism and the failure of its economic policy. Despite such expectations, however, it is not socialism but precisely imperialism that has been invariably moving from one crisis to another. These ideologues are wandering in the darkness. They prefer not to see what is taking place in the Soviet Union: the strengthening and advancement of socialism, and thus accepting the challenge of the scientific and technical revolution in order to upgrade the living standard of the people faster and meet the needs of the entire society. The changes occurring in the socialist world have given a new impetus to the peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism. More than ever before this competition covers problems of human rights and democratization.

Imperialism claimed "monopoly" in matters of democracy and human rights and tried to use such claims against socialism. The Soviet Union refuted such efforts and proved that not capitalism but socialism guarantees to the people true democracy and real human rights. It proved that true—socialist—democracy excludes the exploitation of man by man, the oppression of other nations and discrimination. Socialism is giving a new meaning to the content of the concepts of "democracy" and "human rights" by linking individual to collective rights. It proves that in order for true democracy to act in the interest of the people it must rely on the firm foundation of socialist ownership and develop in a society unfamiliar with exploitation.

Socialism is demonstrating its ability to surmount temporary difficulties in the course of its progress. It is proving its ability to improve, to get rid of means and ways of thinking which hinder progress and to make use of and develop democracy in such a way that the people may be fully and actively involved in restructuring and in the accelerated development of socialist society.

In celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, we see more clearly its pioneering role in proving the fact that the elimination of exploitation of man by man, unemployment, national oppression, poverty and illiteracy is attainable. Through its efforts and example, the Soviet Union has proved to the world that mankind can follow a road radically different from that of capitalism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### October Revolution and Democracy

18020006g Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18,  
Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 56-62

[Article by Grigoris Farakos, member of the Politburo of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee]

[Text] Today, when mankind is approaching the 21st century with great hopes and major concerns, we feel more strongly the need to turn back to the ideas of the Great October Revolution, to understand their meaning creatively in the context of the most relevant universal tasks of our age. This is the only approach which can help us better to understand what it is that links the October Revolution to democracy for instance, something which has now become extremely relevant.

Naturally, we are doing this not for the sake of finding something common between the spirit of the October Revolution and the bourgeois concept of democracy. The latter, when it speaks of its "universal value," ignores the class nature of democracy and shuts its eyes to the fact that "capitalism in general and imperialism in particular turn democracy into an illusion," and that under monopoly capitalism there is a "turn from democracy to political reaction" (see V.I. Lenin, "*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 30, pp 71, 93). In emphasizing the class nature of democracy, we also see that at least a few aspects in the course of the historical evolution of society have a universal validity and that today they are assuming increasing importance. We address ourselves to the problem of democracy in order to single out the Leninist thought expressed during the October Revolution to the effect that democracy is inseparably linked to social progress and socialism. "Socialism," Lenin wrote, "is impossible without democracy in two ways: 1. The proletariat cannot make a socialist revolution unless it is prepared for it through a struggle for democracy; 2. Victorious socialism cannot preserve its victory and lead mankind to the withering away of the state without achieving full democracy" (Ibid, p 128).

The assumption of political power by the working class in October 1917 opened, if one may say so, the only door leading to the new society, a society of freedom, equality and social justice. In addition to everything else, this also marked the triumph of democracy over the worst possible reaction. We know that immediately after the victory of the October Revolution, lacking a firm social base and having lost as a result of the development of political events between February and October 1917 their majority among the people, the organizers of the counterrevolution no longer relied on peaceful means of resistance and unleashed the White terror. Unhesitatingly they resorted to weapons and asked for and received the intervention of foreign armed forces and of international capitalism against the young Soviet system.

The fact that the bolsheviks proved their readiness to reduce violence to a minimum, armed violence in particular, even at a time when the interest of defending the people's regime and their ideas demanded the use of all possible means, was of tremendous international significance. "...We are not using and, I hope, shall not use the terror," Lenin said at the 17 November 1917 session of the Petrograd Soviet, "used by the French revolutionaries, who sent to the guillotine unarmed people" (*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*) [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 63).

It is a fact that in the way in which Russia, experiencing indescribable pain and suffering, brought into the world the October Revolution, in the course of an incredibly fierce and bloodletting struggle against the enemies, the revolution had to assert its profound and true democracy every single minute. It is also true that the Leninist ideas of the dialectical interweaving between the tasks of a democratic and a socialist revolution in our age, the unbreakable link between the struggle for democracy and socialism and the profoundly democratic nature of the socialist revolution had to be theoretically substantiated under circumstances governed by the sharpest possible clashes and confrontations.

At the dawn of our century the revolutionary movement in Russia and, to a certain extent, on an international scale, were by no means identical. The main problem which faced the Russian revolutionaries at that time was the following: Could there be a question of a revolution with a socialist future in a country ruled by tsarist autocracy, a country burdened by feudal and semi-feudal relations, a country with a numerically weak proletariat and less developed industrialization compared with other countries?

The Mensheviks, like the reformist leadership of the social democrats in the European labor movement, relying on their bookish and pedantic interpretation of Marxism, claimed that Russia must not skip bourgeois-democratic development. In the new age which earmarked and put on the agenda, on a universal scale, the transition to socialism, the trend which dominated Marxism at that time was doubly wrong: it virtually separated the task of democratic development, albeit bourgeois-democratic, from the revolutionary labor movement. It was unable to understand that at the stage of bourgeois development, which had greatly advanced on a global scale in each country, including Russia at that time, demand for democracy was formulated in a new fashion and its objectives went far beyond the framework of even the most advanced liberal ideas.

Lenin and the bolsheviks totally defeated these ideas. They countered this dull and schematic theory with creative dialectical Marxism. Lenin replaced a policy which belittled the significance of the revolutionary party and which turned it into a supporter of theoretical structures with a revolutionary policy, developing to the utmost the political initiative of the subjects of the revolution. While other people erected insurmountable

barriers between democratic tasks and the revolutionary movement and between democracy and socialism, Lenin insisted on their closest possible unification. "...There is no way to socialism other than the one going through democracy and political freedom," he wrote in 1905 (op cit., vol 12, p 44). It was thus that Lenin earmarked a new radically different link between the labor movement and democracy and its future, which is of tremendous importance to this day.

Lenin did not object to the fact that the future revolution in Russia will be of a bourgeois-democratic nature. However, this was not to say in the least that the labor movement should be at the tail end of bourgeois democracy. On the contrary, he emphasized, the revolutionary labor movement must head this revolution and mount the struggle on two fronts: both against tsarist autocracy and the Black Hundred movement, as well as against the liberals who were inclined to compromise. It was on this basis that, while retaining full political independence, a different bloc of sociopolitical alliances was to be created with two main interrelated objectives: to become the most consistent democratic force and, with the help of daring political initiative, find the binding link of its hegemony within this bloc (peace, land to the peasants, and real representation of the working people). The future revolution had to be led "to its completion," to a "democracy of a new type," and to "the power of workers and peasants" a revolution which would follow its separate way in seeking means of conversion to socialism.

Lenin's contribution, which was of tremendous significance and great originality, included the following conclusions:

First. In our age there are no democratic tasks, even bourgeois-democratic ones, which would be alien to the revolutionary labor movement. On the basis of democracy a challenge was hurled at the working class which becomes the battle ground of its struggle for achieving hegemony, asserting its independent role and forming sociopolitical alliances. The struggle for democracy becomes inseparable from the struggle for socialism. The revolutionary labor movement can provide revolutionary prospects only when it and its party will have the ability to achieve and assert their leadership in the area of democracy and offer the full development of democracy.

Second. The revolutionary movement must assert itself not only as the most consistent defender of the best democratic gains and traditions but also as the bearer of a new democracy, superior to bourgeois liberal tradition, opening new horizons in the democratic development of mankind. The development of democracy demands socialism and socialism ascribes to democracy a new quality and depth. The transition to socialism is also a transition to a democracy of a new type, which becomes part of socialism.

Lenin did not limit the framework of democracy to the liberal tradition of the time. The new socialist organization of society needed a new democracy. It is no accident that at the most critical stage in Russia's revolutionary development Lenin wrote "*The State and Revolution*." Until then even the most advanced democracy was entrapped by contradictions: the freedom of the people meant freedom against the authority and the state which were hostile and alien to the working people. The October Revolution eliminated this contradiction. Democracy becomes true democracy after the working people have assumed power and when foundations are laid for its increasing exercise by the people themselves. The place of the old state, which is being abolished, is gradually taken over by a state of a new type, which tries to eliminate the age-old distance which separates it from the masses, opening a way to the development, within its own framework, of self-government by the working people. Along with a new representative system, the soviets, new institutions of direct democracy are established, mainly at places of work. New democratic values related to the participation of the working people in decision making appear.

Major obstacles and tremendous difficulties existed along the unknown path followed by the Soviet Union in the course of 70 years after the October Revolution. This path was difficult: it was necessary to undertake the building of socialism in a dislocated and backward country, under conditions of foreign intervention and economic blockade. Under circumstances governed by ceaseless military provocations and constant pressure exerted by imperialism, when matters reached the point of a fierce clash with Nazism, victory was won at the cost of tremendous material damages and, above all, terrible human losses. This was once again followed by efforts to ensure the further development of socialism in its contemporary developed phase. The harshness of these conditions influenced the further shaping of socialist democracy and its forms of development. "The reasons for the fact that in our country socialism was unable to prove all of its possibilities and bring to light the entire wealth of its content," M.S. Gorbachev noted in an interview with the newspaper UNITA, "are found not only in the subjective area but also in the historical circumstances in which we found ourselves."

For subjective reasons, there were lagging, errors and, at times, even major deviations from Leninist strategy. They resulted in the abandonment of some features of democracy. Naturally, in a number of cases this could be explained by the weaknesses of people on whom it befell to follow unknown roads. These were not phenomena inherent in the very nature of socialism. Conversely, they were triggered by the insufficient application of its principles and dynamism.

Nonetheless, as a whole, the 70 years of development of the USSR are a turning point in universal history, the richest possible treasury of practical experience and the prime source of ideas for anyone who wishes to follow

the path of socialism, and an object of pride for all progressive mankind. Nothing of the past should be forgotten. "This, however, does not lower the value of anything we have today," M.S. Gorbachev said at the meeting with heads of mass information media and creative associations, "of anything that was accomplished by the party and the people experiencing these trials.... We must see the tremendous force which is found within socialism, within our system and which was able to withstand all this, which joined the battle against Nazism and won. That is why we must speak of our 70th anniversary with pride in our great people...and its exploit."

The October Revolution proved that socialism is consistent with a significantly more advanced, qualitatively different and superior type of democracy. It is not something superficial but a structural component of the socialist movement itself and its future. But has everything pertaining to the Leninist strategy of democracy and the link between socialism and democracy become part of the distant past?

In our time should the revolutionary labor movement not consider the correlation between its policy and strategy and democracy, and enrich it with new concepts and new elements?

Should socialism itself not steadily assert that it is a significantly more advanced democracy, steadily opening new horizons in the democratic advancement of society? Is democracy not also an indicator and booster of socialist development itself?

Is it not necessary for the contemporary revolutionary movement, in all its manifestations, convincingly to prove itself above all as the bearer of democracy and of the most radical democratic renovation in our time?

On the contrary. Today anything which is the legacy of the Leninist strategy and thinking, the legacy of the October Revolution in the field of democracy, assumes new scope and relevance. Nothing makes such relevance more noticeable than the changes taking place in the USSR, in the society which gave birth to the October Revolution. These are changes of a revolutionary nature, which are centered around the dynamic development of democracy in all areas, on the basis of socialism and for the sake of even more socialism.

The entire world, particularly the working people, follow with interest the efforts to create a new dynamic political atmosphere of developed democracy in the USSR, the new headlong awakening of the masses for active participation in comprehensive decision making and a critical dialogue in society, increased glasnost and people's control, the acquisition of broader, more real and decisive rights by representative authorities, bold widening of democracy at work so that the newly developed self-government institutions may acquire flesh and blood.

Despite some claims to the contrary, it is clear that such efforts were not started from scratch. Such claims are occasionally made with the clear intention of slandering and undermining socialism; sometimes they stem from proper motivations but are influenced by ignorance or misunderstanding, for if we accurately assess the significance of democracy and participation of the masses, we can easily draw the conclusion that had the Soviet Union started from nothing, it would have been unable to achieve such radical revolutionary changes, to resist the deadly fascist aggression and to reach its present heights of economic, social and cultural progress. More than ever before, making a major qualitative leap in the development of democracy and its values, immobilizing all material, spiritual and moral forces of the society through the maximally possible participation of the masses as a necessary prerequisite for the acceleration of economic and social development, as required by the time, has become a vital necessity. Also more than ever before today we find relevant Lenin's words expressed on the day after the October Revolution: "We must grant full freedom for the creativity of the people's masses" (op cit., vol 35, p 27).

The ruling capitalist circles try to surmount the crisis in their society today through the arms race, by limiting the rights of the working people and restoring the old, along with the new, forms of authoritarianism, curtailing democracy and turning to a political, cultural and spiritual reaction in all areas. Meanwhile, proving its humanism and superiority, socialism is answering the challenge of our age, surmounting its own contradictions and lagging and using as a locomotive engine efforts to develop democracy and its values, unparalleled in human history. Once again we realize the deep meaning of Lenin's statement: "...Victorious socialism without full democracy is impossible..." (op cit., vol 27, p 253).

It is clear that Soviet society, relying on its present achievements, is thus taking up and developing under contemporary Soviet life the most valuable features of the legacy of the October Revolution and Lenin's behests. It tries to promote a new, a higher quality of life in all its aspects, proving this quality, for the first time in history, in the daily practice of the people and providing it with lofty moral and structural elements. This will be achieved through the full participation of one and all in joint projects, by ensuring the interaction among all working people in the defense of socialism and its further strengthening, and by upgrading reciprocal respect which will be naturally linked with the all-round increase in material possibilities and, spiritual life, which has tremendous power and value today.

It is a question of a problem which Lenin raised with exceptional perspicacity in one of his last works, "On the Cooperative," in which he wrote that with the development of such interaction in society, "a great deal of what could seem fantastic and even romantic or trite in the dreams of the old cooperativists is becoming the most

unadorned reality" (op cit., vol 45, p 369). He emphasized most strongly that "strictly speaking, 'only' one thing is left for us: to make our population so 'civilized,' that it could understand all the benefits of comprehensive participation in cooperatives and to organize such participation. 'Only' this. No other wise thoughts are needed by us today in order to convert to socialism. However, in order to achieve this 'only' we need an entire upheaval, an entire stretch of cultural development of the entire popular mass" (Ibid, p 372).

This is no longer questionable. The revolution, which took place 70 years ago and which was strengthened along a difficult road and has displayed the greatest possible achievements in the history of human societies, is continuing with impressive resolve and inspiration. On the threshold of the year 2000 it is making the Soviet Union, with even greater dynamism, the focal point of the hopes of all mankind.

The ideas of the October Revolution fructified the progressive and revolutionary movements in all countries. They have become, as Lenin emphasized, "the torch of international socialism" and an "example to all toiling masses" (op cit., vol 35, p 279). They were a motivating challenge for Greece as well, with its weak labor movement and the first establishment of socialist and Marxist groups.

Five days after the victory of the October Revolution, the newspaper RIZOSPASTIS (which at that time supported democratic principles and subsequently and to this day has been the organ of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee) condemned the slanderous attacks mounted by the reactionary press and, in particular, emphasized the democratic nature of the October Revolution: "History will provide its judgment of this, when peace is established in the world and when the scale of the influence of the principles proclaimed by the soviets for the fullest possible democratic outcome of the present struggle and the most humane organization of postwar society will be manifested in their entire magnitude." This is merely one of the many confirmations of the fact that the socialist revolution met with great response in Greece as well. Even the liberal bourgeois press acknowledged the upheaval which it created in the old world. NEA ELLAS, one such newspaper, wrote in its 21 October 1918 issue that "Russian bolshevism in Greece is a ghost which is pursuing the political and social power and has frightened it quite suitably."

However, the revolution had a particular impact on the shaping and development in our country of a communist movement and, 1 year later, in November 1918, on the creation of an organized political force, which is the present Greek Communist Party. For that reason, from its very first steps, the GCP expressed its admiration of the October Revolution and its solidarity with it. The greetings of the party's Central Committee on the occasion of the third anniversary of the October Revolution pointed out that "...All working people and the entire

conscious proletariat on the planet have felt the life-bringing wind of the Russian Revolution, which has given new strength and conviction to the struggling working class and which has made all the numerous pillars of contemporary society to freeze in horror.... The conscious Greek proletariat, at that time weak and poor, heard and profoundly felt the liberating call of the Russian Revolution..., a proletariat which hurt from the difficulties but celebrated the triumphant victories of the Red Army of Russian workers and peasants today, together with the revolutionaries the world over, sends its revolutionary greetings to the great offspring of the Russian Revolution.... Long live the free republic of Russian workers and peasants!"

The GCP, which firmly relies on the fundamental principles, has made a major contribution to the struggle for the freedom of the people in the course of slightly less than 70 years of its existence. It has developed a rich heritage of democratic traditions. Today its tactics and strategy are focused with even greater reason and more decisively and more dynamically on the problem of democracy, in the sense of its present defense and search for ways and means for its qualitative progress toward future changes and socialism. Such progress will include all the freedoms gained by the people, strengthen them and, above all, ensure the decisive growth of democracy, thanks to the new representative institutions, direct democracy and self-government. In that area our party is constantly enriching its thoughts and formulating the new problems based on the contemporary needs of our working people and our society, tirelessly drawing creative incentives from the legacy of the October Revolution, the development and experience of the socialist countries and the changes which are being tested in those countries, in the Soviet Union above all.

It is noteworthy that the report of the GCP Central Committee to the 12th Party Congress, which was held recently, in May 1987, noted the following: "All real democratic progress is inseparably related to changes and socialism. The struggle for the broadening and expansion of democratic freedoms is the best area for promoting change oriented toward socialism. Conversely, the changes will broaden and make real all the democratic freedoms the people have gained. They will develop new democratic rights, promote the democratization of the state apparatus and all social institutions and create new democratic institutions which will decisively develop the participation of the people."

Today we emphasize even more persistently that the strength of the people's freedom and their development, the strength of a truly equal and open confrontation among parties is the most reliable way of a conversion to changes and to socialism and the most reliable base for weakening within them the influence of bourgeois parties, strengthening and expanding sociopolitical alliances for the sake of progress and for the strengthening of the revolutionary movement and the antimonopoly socialist development of our country.

Our party is fully aware of the need to enrich and update its democratic heritage under contemporary conditions. It is fully aware of the need to be not only the true and consistent bearer of the most progressive and radical democratic changes in Greek society, changes aimed at socialism, but also to attain this role and consolidate it and earn the increasing recognition by the Greek people of such a role. The party is advancing toward socialism in Greece, increasingly strengthening itself in the awareness of the masses above all as a growing force of democracy and as aspiring toward efficient democracy in the country's life.

Seventy years after the October Revolution it has become even clearer that in an increasingly integral and interdependent world the internationalist values of our movement are assuming growing significance and relevance and that such values must be promoted, enriched and developed in an atmosphere of equality, autonomy and originality of each detachment of communists and revolutionaries.

The commonality of our destinies and prospects and the fact that real progress in achieving revolutionary objectives in each country are much more closely related to the overall increase in the role and importance of the communist movement as the most contemporary trend in the struggle for change, peace and progress, are becoming increasingly obvious.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

#### **Juridical Science and Practice Under Conditions of Restructuring**

*18020006h Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 63-66*

[Text] Further answers to the questions asked in KOMMUNIST (see Nos 14 and 15 for 1987).

**A.D. Boykov**, doctor of juridical sciences, professor, head of sector at the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Problems of Strengthening Legality and Law and Order of the USSR Prosecutor's Office:

4. The bar is one of the most important guarantors of legality in the activities of law enforcement authorities and in protecting the rights and interests of the citizens. In my view, its social status and problems of improving its work must be subject to extensive and practical discussions.

Of late the press has increasingly been addressing itself to this topic. The overall theme of the majority of articles has been the demand to enhance the role of the bar in ensuring legality and giving attorneys additional rights. However, ideas and suggestions which are worthy of attention are frequently paralleled by exaggerations of

the role and merits of this institution and its representatives. Some legal scientists are ready to see the bar as just about the main instrument in the struggle for justice. For the time being there are no grounds for such optimism. I am saying this as a former lawyer with 15 years of practice and as a scientist who has studied the activities of the bar.

The significance of the bar in the juridical mechanism is indeed great, for which reason it plays a major role in social life. Lawyers give citizens hundreds of thousands and even millions of pieces of advice and references concerning legislation. They draw up a tremendous number of so-called business papers, participate in criminal and civil trials and provide legal services to enterprises, establishments and organizations.

Such a broad scale of participation of lawyers in legal practices frequently leads to increased expectations of this institution and groundless demands put on it. Thus, we frequently read about "lawyers' control of legality," and claims that attorneys in criminal cases are always in pursuit of the truth.

Unquestionably, the activities of an attorney could and do contribute to strengthening legality and determining the truth. However, the attorney must not act against the interests of the principal and the defendant. Furthermore, an attorney is legally forbidden to refuse to defend someone and, consequently, to become a prosecutor in order to find the truth.

The contribution of a lawyer to strengthening legality is limited not only by the one-sidedness of his functions. It could be greatly reduced by the poor quality of his work. Unfortunately, quite frequently a lawyer can give only a general advice and may be quite ignorant of the law. Also widespread is the practice of lawyers refusing to give legal aid to clients, directing them to seek explanations from various governmental and public organizations.

In newspaper essays lawyers are presented above all as attorneys for the defense in criminal cases and as lonely and dedicated fighters for justice, the only people to question the accuracy of the charge and to react to human suffering as though it were their own. Is such the case? Quite frequently, it is. Alas, however, also quite frequently the precise opposite takes place.

A study of a considerable number of cases in which, in the final account, the defendant was acquitted, has shown that in 1 case out of 5 or 6 the lawyers for the defense did not dispute the charge, as though encouraging the court to pass an unwarranted sentence. In such cases errors in the preliminary investigation have been corrected without the help of the attorneys and even despite them. This study, which covered the period of the 1970s was awarded a prize by the presidium of the Moscow City Lawyers' Collegium.

Here are even more recent data. In 1986 a group of scientific workers studied 250 criminal cases in which the courts corrected investigation errors. It turned out that the initiative for the exposure of such errors could be credited to the lawyers in only 29 percent of the cases. This too is not bad. Nonetheless, the main credit in exposing and eliminating investigation errors went to the courts and the prosecution. I believe that this must be borne in mind when the latter are criticized in the press and recommendations are made on correcting negative manifestations in criminal trials.

We know how severely bar collectives have been criticized by the authorities on the matter of the quality of appeals. The weakness of the proofs they submit, their low level of legal standards and even general literacy have been noted. Studies have also indicated that many of the rights the defense has are either being used very poorly by the lawyers or not used at all.

Today a great deal is being said and written about the need to allow the lawyer to participate in a criminal trial at an earlier stage of the proceedings. Indeed, such a step would provide a major additional guarantee that investigations are conducted in accordance with the law. However, it is very important to maintain a feeling of proper measure in determining the rights of the defense.

Speaking of protecting the rights of the defendant, we should not forget the interests of society, which has the right to rely on the effective actions of state authorities in the struggle against crime and in protecting the victim's rights. Nor should we forget the fact that the preliminary investigation of a crime, its exposure, prevention and creation of prerequisites for compensating for material damages caused as a result of criminal activities cannot be successful under conditions of total openness. Hence the inevitability of some restrictions imposed on the defendant and his attorney, particularly in terms of familiarity with the facts of a case prior to the completion of the investigation.

Recent articles have raised questions of material incentive for lawyers' work. These are no simple matters. Lawyers, who have a lighter workload and less responsibility, earn, on an average, a higher wage than investigators, prosecutors and judges. Furthermore, rates for the individual types of legal aid have now become virtually symbolic: no more than 2 rubles can be paid for consultations which require the study of court and other documents, drafting pardon petitions, claims, and so on! Obviously, such rates must be revised as, actually, the very idea of the maximum earnings which, considering the piece-meal form of payment, is absurd.

Speaking of paying for the work of a lawyer, we must also mention additional payments made by clients. Today persistent requests are being heard in favor of legalizing such payments as a bonus for particularly good work. In my view, payments over and above the rates lead to the



corruption of specialists, for from voluntary contributions such payments soon become an object of extortion, encouraging the type of services which leads to the violation of professional morality and the law. Furthermore, where is the boundary between voluntary and mandatory payment? And why should additional payments be the privilege of lawyers only? Do judges, investigators, chairmen of executive committees, physicians, tailors and so on, not need any encouragement? And why should such payments not be made by grateful defendants, customers and patients? I believe that some people may consider this idea wild. Strangely enough, some lawyers and scientific workers consider it entirely acceptable when it comes to lawyers.

The active use of all the means and opportunities granted by the law is what is demanded by the bar and that is what the people expect of it. A great deal is being done to perfect its work. Lawyers are being retrained in special institutions for the advancement of cadres within the system of the Ministry of Justice. Presidiums of collegiums are organizing various seminars for lawyers. Scientists are making recommendations. The USSR Supreme Court has issued a special guideline on the practice of the application of the laws by the courts, which ensures the accused the right to a defense, and a number of other resolutions which create a favorable system for the activities of defense lawyers and for lawyers representing victims, civil claims and civil liability. Changes are being made in procedural legislation, making court procedures more democratic. Nonetheless, the main feature remains the personality of the lawyer and his professional standards and moral qualities. In this connection I support the frequently published consideration of the inadmissibility of coercively adding to lawyers' collegiums individuals who have compromised themselves in previous jobs with state law-enforcement authorities. The bar is not a penal battalion!

This problem has yet another aspect which is usually ignored: the level of competence of the state guidance of lawyers. The legal departments of union and republic ministries of justice are small and staffed by people who are not always sufficiently familiar with the specific nature of lawyers' activities. Although more or less dealing with their control-organizational functions, they are usually unable to provide methodical aid to lawyers and to supply them with the necessary aids and referential publications. The poor professional help to attorneys which such managers provide is frequently compensated by far-fetched initiatives and various measures.

Several years ago, the RSFSR Ministry of Justice supported the initiative of the presidium of the Moscow City Collegium of the Bar on drafting a set of rules for lawyers: a basic guide on the most important areas of attorney activities. A group of authors consisting of experienced lawyers and scientists was set up and the work was written. Nonetheless, it did not see the light.

For the past several decades the question of setting up an all-union public authority, which would bring together the scattered lawyers' groups and assume the functions of a scientific-method center has been discussed. This authority would be entirely self-financing. It is to be hoped that the USSR Ministry of Justice would assume the responsibility and do some serious work in solving problems related to the activities of lawyers, which is very topical question under the conditions of the democratization of society.

**N.Ya. Sokolov**, docent, CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences, candidate of juridical sciences:

5. Qualitative improvements in the training of legal cadres and upgrading their professional, ideological-political and cultural standards are major structural components in restructuring the work of law enforcement authorities and providing the necessary prerequisites for strengthening legality, as was noted at the January 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. This is closely related to legal training.

In my view, the fact that until recently the orientation in the training of legal specialists was essentially directed toward the needs of legal departments rather than the interests of the entire national economy conflicts with the requirements of reality. It is indicative that in the 11th 5-year period the share of requests submitted by law enforcement authorities for jurists with higher training accounted for over 90 percent of the total. As such requests were being met, the view developed that a further increase in the training of legal cadres would result in the "overproduction" of specialists.

I cannot agree with such a viewpoint. The intensified role of commodity-monetary relations, economic methods used in national economic management and the expanded individual labor and cooperative activities, which presume a more active utilization of legal forms of regulating social relations, demand a greater number of jurists. Furthermore, the increased size of the population and of the amount of legal services provided to the citizens substantially increase the workload of juridical personnel.

As noted in the specialized press, the higher educational institutions meet only 65 to 70 percent of the need for legal cadres. Legal services in the countryside must be developed further, although in industry as well such services exist in no more than one-third of all enterprises. The importance of a legal service as part of the executive committees of rayon and city soviets of people's deputies is stipulated in the decree of the USSR Council of Ministers "On Training Legal Cadres for Soviet Agencies."

We must draft and issue a standard nomenclature of positions to be filled by specialists with higher and secondary legal training in the executive committees of

the soviets, the economic agencies, enterprises, organizations and establishments; recommendations must be issued to determine the number of such specialists in the future. This work would enable us substantially to improve planning in the training of legal cadres. The USSR Ministry of Justice could determine the need for such cadres for the country as a whole.

The lack of reliable data on the need for jurists, added to other reasons, has adversely affected their assignment in the various parts of the country. Whereas in a number of krais and oblasts in the RSFSR, Siberia, the North and the Far East above all, there is a shortage of lawyers, there is a surplus in some autonomous republics, the Transcaucasus, Central Asia and the oblasts in the Northern Caucasus.

Let us also point out major disproportions in the development of higher and secondary legal training, particularly on the territorial level. At the present time, the training of cadres in the law within the system of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, is provided at the law schools and departments of 47 universities and four law VUZs, including the All-Union Juridical Correspondence Institute. The VUZs which train legal cadres are located in 61 cities. Furthermore, we have a parallel system of higher educational institutions of the USSR MVD, the expediency of which has been questioned by some authoritative legal scientists and teachers.

There is an imbalance in the correlation between full-time and correspondence forms in the training of law students, which cannot fail to affect the level of training of legal cadres and the quality of professional legal knowledge. At the start of the 1986/87 school year, 29.5 percent of law students were full-time students; 14.9 percent attended evening school and 55.6 percent were training by correspondence. We believe that the share of full-time legal training should be raised to 50-60 percent.

We must also maintain normal ratios in training jurists with higher and secondary education. Today legal work requiring secondary training is frequently performed by individuals who have higher legal training or, conversely, people without any legal training. The policy which was adopted several years ago of supplying the administrative authorities, including those in the national economy, with specialists with secondary legal training is correct. However, the current pace of training leaves open more than 100,000 positions for officials in charge of civil status registrations, problems of social security, execution of court decisions, acceptance of complaints and petitions by citizens, classification of legal acts, introduction of referential-coding work, etc.

It would be expedient for the USSR Minvuz to draft, together with the legal departments, forecasts on the basic indicators for the development of legal training until the year 2000 and to formulate a general system for the deployment of training facilities throughout the

country. This would enable us to ensure an efficient correlation in the training of lawyers with higher and second specialized knowledge, upgrading their skills, perfecting retraining and gradually streamlining the network of training institutions.

We are concerned with the level of the theoretical and practical training of future juridical specialists. The current curriculums, programs, scientific-methodical documentation and textbooks and aids have become largely obsolete. Depending on the area of specialization, the curriculums include between 38 and 44 separate subjects. However, such curriculums do not call for acquainting law students with the problems of the struggle against crime, the method for detecting and investigating crimes committed by officials, and the specific economics, social mentality and problems of the scientific organization of labor in law enforcement and other juridical agencies and establishments.

Ensuring the optimal correlation between the training of a lawyer with general training and extensive professional specialization is a major prerequisite for efficient training in the law. Legal training so far retains its court-prosecution-investigation trend which developed as early as the mid-1930s. Nonetheless, although 10 percent of the training time is allocated for the specialized training of law students, they are not given an adequate amount of specialized knowledge and skills which are required for some types of juridical activities extremely needed by society.

The content and standard of any type of education, including legal, depend, above all, on the nature of the faculty. The organization of numerous centers for the training of jurists has been such that because of the small number of trainees, some universities created law departments as sections of their history, geography and other departments. The professional scientific-pedagogical standard of training in such departments is insufficiently high, which substantially affects the training of students. Many law-school teachers not only lack practical experience but also insufficient contacts with the courts, the prosecution, the justice agencies and internal affairs authorities.

We know that until recently it was impossible in many schools to enroll in departments training specialists in the legal sciences without influential connections. Nor is it a secret that a number of legal skills have been considered as nothing other than "profitable positions." No importance was ascribed to the social composition of the students in law schools. In a number of legal institutes and law schools of universities gross violations of the procedure for VUZ enrollment were exposed. In this connection we must support the efforts of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, which reviewed the procedure for the enrollment of students in law studies. Today people recommended by party, soviet, Komsomol, law enforcement agencies and military units, and individuals with practical training for

no less than 2 years, who have distinguished themselves in public work, and who are politically mature and morally impeccable may enroll. However, as this year's enrollment indicated, such steps can be effective only with a good organization and glasnost in issuing recommendations for enrollment in law schools.

The organization of educational work is particularly important in the training of legal cadres. We must achieve an optimal combination among all forms of curricular and extracurricular work in developing among the students the type of professional, ideological-political, moral and general cultural qualities which are most consistent with the character of a future jurist. The moral level of jurists' activities has always been of exceptional importance, although greatly underestimated. Today conditions are being created to correct this situation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### **Ownership in the Socialist Production Relations System**

18020006i Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 67-76

[Article by Viktor Yevgenyevich Dementyev, candidate of economic sciences, senior scientific associate, USSR Academy of Sciences Central Economic-Mathematical Institute, and Yuriy Viktorovich Sukhotin, doctor of economic sciences, leading scientific associate, TsEMI]

[Text] The radical restructuring of the economic mechanism requires the enhancement and intensification of the study of production relations of socialism and, above all, their foundations: socialist ownership. In our view, extensive opportunities exist for upgrading the nature of the study of such problems related to a revision of the existing simplistic concepts, stereotypes and dogmas which revealed their theoretical and practical groundlessness.

### **I**

Marxism singles out determining (based on the distribution of production conditions) and determined (based on the distribution of consumer goods) groups of production relations. "Any distribution of consumer goods is always nothing but the consequence of the distribution of production conditions themselves. The distribution of the latter expresses the nature of the production method itself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "*Soch.*" [Works], vol 19, p 20). Consequently, Marx defines as "distribution of production conditions" the basic production relation, which is the nature of ownership of means of production.

The distinction between the two levels of production relations is so important that Marx relates to it the very understanding of the nature of socialism, indicating the

inadmissibility of interpreting it as a system determined above all by the means of the division of goods: "vulgarized socialism....accepted from bourgeois economists a way of considering....distribution as something independent of the production method and, hence, presenting matters as though socialism revolves primarily around problems of distribution" (Ibid). Unlike the socialist ideology which preceded it, Marxism bases the economic and political power of the working people and its strengthening on the development of socialist ownership and a proprietary attitude by all members of society toward national property. However, the feeling of ownership cannot be promoted with words. "The attitude toward ownership," the 27th CPSU Congress emphasized, "is shaped above all by the real circumstances in which a man functions, and the possibility of his influence on the organization of the production process, distribution and the utilization of labor results. Therefore, the problem rests in the further intensification of socialist economic self-government."

Nonetheless, some economists reduce the essence of the renovation of production relations merely to a more systematic implementation of the principle "to each according to his work," contained within the framework of distribution in the narrow meaning of the term, applicable only to consumer goods. Such a narrow distribution interpretation of production relations hinders the study of one of the main negative phenomena in the economy: the nonproprietary attitude toward public means of production, which does not allow us to bring to light the socioeconomic foundations of the policy of involving the masses in public production management and, in the final account, conflicts with the stipulations of the 27th CPSU Congress on the need to perfect the relations of socialist ownership themselves. Furthermore, this approach does not contribute to understanding actual economic behavior, reducing its economic motivations to the aspiration of obtaining more consumer goods for oneself.

The main motivation for the actions of the participants in the production process is the aspiration to preserve and improve their socioeconomic status, the consequence of which is gaining a certain access to the distribution of consumer goods. The behavior of the working people themselves could be directed primarily toward adapting to existing socioeconomic conditions or changing them, depending on the extent to which the latter has matured historically. Naturally, the working people are by no means indifferent toward the question of streamlining the interconnection between work and reward. The systematic violations of the principle of distribution according to labor, characteristic of the obsolete economic mechanism, became a major hindrance to production efficiency, undermining interest in high-quality production work. At the same time, the working people are not satisfied with the demand of improving nothing but this specific stratum of economic relations and are trying to influence ever more actively the process of making most important national economic decisions.

The formulation of the task of radically updating relations of socialist ownership revealed the groundlessness of many theoretical elaborations which developed during the period of stagnation. During that period views which belittled the role of ownership in the system of socialist economic categories became particularly popular. They reduced its importance merely to the general premise of a planned economy which, having been established, subsequently remains unchanged, unrelated directly to the specific economic motivations and behavior of the participants in the economic process.

Some economists have come to denying ownership as a production relation, proclaiming it a purely legal category deprived of economic content or else related only to the material aspect of the production process. In that case ownership is confused with its object—property—as is the case in the bourgeois interpretations of capital as being merely a means of production. For example, a substantial difference has been claimed to exist between the nature of ownership of items manufactured through the socialist production process and those used in socialist production but come from nonsocialist economies (such as the expropriation of former owners, imports, etc.). Replacing them with objects manufactured under socialism was presented as strengthening the socialist nature of ownership. Such a blending of relations of ownership with its objects leads to curious conclusions, such as the fact that foreign trade becomes an export-import production relation and very durable goods perpetuate under socialism relations reflecting the period during which they were produced. Within such theoretical approaches the renovation of ownership relations appears as though replacing worn-out objects.

Frequently ownership is replaced by planning in an effort to prove that socialist planning can appear even before ownership and independently of it.

Another extreme in the interpretation of ownership was manifested in applying it to the virtually entire system of production relations, which depreciates the concept of ownership as the foundation of the economic system. For example, the dynamics of the public product and its individual parts, the organization of cost accounting, wages, the price and taxation systems, the distribution of the net product and profits and the income of society, labor collectives and individual workers are included in the forms of realizing socialist ownership. Noteworthy in this case is the absence of a criterion which would determine the classification of said relations as ownership and thus prevent the identification of the latter with the sum total of production relations. Such a criterion could be Marx's distinction between the distribution of production conditions and of production methods. It would be logical to consider as part of ownership precisely relations of distribution of production conditions which determine the nature of the social system.

The other approaches to the interpretation of ownership borrow distinctions used in legal publications in classifying property rights—ownership, management and use.

The inadequacy of this classification is that it is not an objective subordination existing within the set of ownership relations. In our view, a single category, that of "managing," would suffice. However, it is very important to distinguish within it the unconditional and sovereign management (ownership as such) and the conditional one—handling property by entitled individuals or groups on behalf of and as authorized by the owner. This distinction reflects essential differences in economic interests and provides a key to economic behavior. The stipulations formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress reflect the Marxist-Leninist view of ownership as an active socioeconomic base of any means of production and determining the entire organization of the entire system of economic management and its efficiency, and the level of production efficiency and rationality.

Ownership of production conditions is the equivalent of supreme and sovereign economic power. It means that the owner manages the facility as he wishes, regardless of anyone else. His power is absolute. Marx emphasized that "the capitalist is not a capitalist because he is managing an industrial enterprise but, conversely, he becomes an industrial manager because he is a capitalist. Supreme power in industry becomes the attribute of capital..." (op cit., vol 23, p 344). Noting that the building of huge projects in antiquity was based on the concentration of a tremendous amount of manpower and facilities, exclusively at the disposal of the supreme rulers, Marx goes on to say that "this power of Asian or Egyptian kings, Etruscan priests, and so on, has been transferred in contemporary society to the capitalist, regardless of whether or not he operates as an individual capitalist or as a combined capitalist, as is the case of shareholding companies" (Ibid, p 345).

The other types and levels of power in the economy are linked by the fact that they conditionally manage the property of the owner, ensure the running of the project as empowered by him and for his account. The participants in the production process (manager and rank-and-file workers) constitute a hierarchy of conditional managers answerable to the owner and to superior managers. Various types and independent managers function in situations of partnership (contractual) relations. The basis of their economic behavior is the strengthening and improvement of their social positions. There is a profound contrast between the status of the owner and that of the conditional manager, influenced by efficiency and work quality.

Economic management, in terms of ownership, means preservation and multiplication of property. Success in this matter directly strengthens the position of the owner. The owner must be a good manager, otherwise the adverse results caused by loss of property would lead to a partial or total loss of his social status. Conversely, a characteristic concern of the manager, which is aimed at strengthening his own position (place, job) involves less the success of the common project than the approval of the management, the requirements of which must be

satisfied through his work. The manager socially benefits not only from its improvement but also from a lowering of demands placed on him. That is why good management needs a sovereign power and efficient control and the stimulation of managers by the owner. The duality in the behavior of the manager and the presence within such a behavior of components negative in terms of the enterprise are the reasons for many conflicts in a modern economy.

The economic interference of the owner makes it socially dangerous to the executor to use ways of achieving a positive rating, such as concealing real opportunities, ascribing losses and failures to objective circumstances and to the actions of others, and demand for adequate rating indicators. The activeness of the owner does not eliminate such negative trends but merely neutralizes them, making conscientious and efficient work the virtually only way open to the conditional manager. Conversely, any weakening of the sovereign principle is a negative component which promotes irresponsibility and whitewashing.

These trends were manifested particularly strongly under the conditions of the development of corporate (shareholding) form of ownership. Marx noted that this form "reproduces a new financial aristocracy, a new variety of parasites consisting of promoters of hare-brained schemes, founders of companies and purely nominal directors,...an entire system of fraud and swindle in the area of founding companies, issuing stock and trading in shares. This means private production without control over private ownership" (op cit., vol 25, part I, p 482).

Nonetheless, we should not ignore the fact that capitalist corporations base their prosperity on the mass production of a variety of goods and retain their ability to engage in the extensive application of new equipment, precise implementation of procurement obligations, etc. In our view, the fact that the "wasteful-predatory" trends in the activities of corporations have not brought about a noticeable lowering of efficiency is due to the preservation of the strong positions of the large owners in corporate management, the essentially repressive nature of stimulation of workers and the lack of guarantee of survival of even large companies, inherent in capitalism.

Under socialism the importance of the distinction between sovereign and conditional management substantially increases as a result of extending the latter to the level of sectorial and national economic management carried out on behalf of the entire society. The collective nature of socialist ownership demands highly developed forms of democracy. However, the mechanisms which gives co-owners of public property the opportunity of exercising real control over its use have proved to be insufficiently developed. This is explained by the difficulty of the task itself and the concentration of economic power in the hands of a rapidly strengthened command apparatus.

Strong and active sovereign economic power helps to implement policy on all levels of the economic hierarchy (from rank-and-file workers to the highest managers), encouraging the positive and neutralizing the negative components of conditional management behavior. The forms of this influence are historically specific and determined by the nature of the social system and can include a wide range of means of management, from direct orders which demand the strict implementation to circuitous motivating influences made possible by the wide autonomy of individuals and collectives.

If the principles of sovereignty are weakened all forms and methods of management which ensure efficiency turn into their opposites. The energetic urging on of performers to rise to the level of frontranking accomplishments is replaced by the emulation of the weakest, based on the slogan of "working without laggards." Frontrankers, who show real possibilities, are being discouraged by a variety of means, by belittling their accomplishments, hindering their further work and supporting at their expense the worst performers. Useful and progressive means of economic management and progressive technologies used in organizing model production sectors are replaced by inflated record seeking, which draws away resources needed for the normal functioning of the other production units. Initiative, enterprise and sensible risk are replaced by unrestrained technical and economic adventurism at the expense of society. One of the characteristic negative phenomena of the period of stagnation in our economy was, unfortunately, departmental hare-brained scheming which has caused tremendous harm to the national economy.

## II

Property by the whole nation is the foundation of socialism and its specifically distinctive feature. Every working person operates on the basis of two main socioeconomic positions, not only as the co-owner of the entire public property but also the conditional manager of the sector entrusted to him. That is why he displays both the feeling of owner as well as that of the conditional manager, something which can influence his activities also against the public interest and hinder his participation in the restructuring of existing relations to which he has managed to adapt.

The underdeveloped nature of the procedures for exercising the sovereign rights of the working people led to the appearance of a conditional-executive shortcut in the economic mechanism, which cannot be compensated by expanding and increasing the complexity of the administrative apparatus.

Naturally, under socialism relations in production management no longer express class antagonism or the exploitation of man by man. However, the conditional-managerial shortcut weakened the cohesion between managers and managed as members of a socialist society. This resulted in the appearance and intensification of a

cohesion of a different nature: the joint interest shown by managers and managed in lowering requirements concerning work results. In this case a feature of administrative activities is the aspiration to ensure plans which are easy to fulfill and the creation of a reliable material and financial base for the departmental system and to facilitate direct obligations. The latter are manifested not only in the reduced volume of managerial work but also in its qualitative simplification, for a reduced obligation would be considered as the most noticeable feature of the uselessness of a given agency. Conversely, escalating the amount of routine operations is a convenient means of narrowing the range of assignments (avoiding interdepartmental coordination, problems of a long-term nature, etc.) and escaping creative search and development of new forms of organization which involve higher risk. One of the most durable primitive procedures is that of the notorious planning on the basis of achievements, which indeed frequently makes assignments unbearable. This largely explains the increased self-protecting reaction of performers. They actively engage in all possible efforts to lower assignments and to ensure the allocation of additional resources. In the interest of society, the motivation mechanism should contribute to identifying the production potential and to replacing the approach "from the level attained" with the principle "from the level of possibility."

The inner logic of said motivations could not fail to bring about the intensification of the negative and the suppression of the positive components of economic behavior and the appearance of a mechanism of socio-economic obstruction. This greatly determined the freezing and inefficient use of significant share of national economic resources which cause shortages, overloading and worsened quality of output and services. Increasingly, the form of development and issuance of plans encourage the noncontrollability of the economy and the development of loose trends. The system of ordering, the purpose of which was to act on behalf of the entire society and in its interest, has been frequently applied against them.

We cannot agree with a view according to which economic difficulties are described as the consequences of lack of directives and the solution is sought not in the qualitative transformation of management but only in strengthening command and increasing and issuing stricter planned assignments in detail and in physical terms. The facts indicate that the uncontrolled lowering of economic efficiency was the consequence of the adaptation of production workers to the command method of issuing assignments and seeking resources. It was precisely in the 1970s and beginning of 1980s, when the principles of the economic reform of 1965 were abandoned and when administrative management methods intensified, that the effect of the obstruction mechanism became clearly manifested.

### III

The development of economic autonomy and commodity-monetary relations is a progressive trend in restructuring, leading toward increasing the share of indirect value influences exerted by the center on economic activities. Nonetheless, until recently, it was the administrative type of management that prevailed. This greatly predetermined the establishment of an image of real socialism as it developed in the ordinary consciousness in our country and abroad. It is not astounding that the rejection of such a method of management occasionally meets with a lack of understanding on the part of supporters of socialism, giving its opponents reason to predict that the market will prevail over the plan and will bring about the "dismantling" of socialism.

The ideological foundation for such views is the thesis that commodity relations are alien to the socialist economic system and cannot be coupled with ownership by the whole people, and the fact that the commodity-monetary mechanism is the opposite of planned management. This idea is found in the concepts of many Soviet theoretical economists. The stipulation that "to the extent to which the production process is commodity oriented it is not planned. To the extent to which it is planned, it is not commodity oriented" has become almost fundamental. This claim is wrong both logically and factually. Planning and commodity marketing are not opposites: the opposite of commodity production is a barter economy and of planning, lack of planning and lack of control. As to the actual situation, not to mention the unquestionable existence of planning within commodity producing enterprises (capitalist in particular), the Marxist classics emphasized that in the course of the development of a comprehensive commodity output, for a long time commodity relations remain combined with a planned organization and public control based on communal ownership and its subsequent modifications. "...The earlier forms of society in which crafts developed naturally were subsequently crystallized and, finally, codified by the law, presenting...a picture of planned and authoritarian organization of public labor..." (op cit., vol 23, p 369). The separation among producers was achieved when they started to trade and, subsequently, used traders. The trading partners "were surrounded by competitors and outside customers. They sold at prices set by mutual agreement. Their commodities were of a specified quality guaranteed by public control..." (op cit., vol 25, part II, p 476). Planned control occasionally was applied even to complex forms of commodity-monetary relations, such as setting the same profit norms (Ibid, p 477). Therefore, pitting all commodity marketing and all planning against each other is totally groundless.

We believe that the problem of the compatibility of commodity-monetary relations and the socialist economic system could be positively solved only on the basis of the study of the set of ownership relations and

distinguishing among their sovereign and conditional-mandatory levels. Many of the errors concerning commodity production under socialism are found in the simplistic concept of the nature of ownership as a prerequisite for commodity relations. The Marxist classics frequently write about private ownership and full socioeconomic separation of commodity producers. This frequently leads to the direct conclusion that since under socialism there is no private ownership there can be no commodity relations. However, they considered in their works also the combination of commodity relations with other forms of ownership present under different economic systems. "...The production of and trade in commodities," K. Marx pointed out, "is a phenomenon inherent in a great variety of production methods, although their degree of significance may vary greatly" (op cit., vol 23, p 124). In order for the development of commodity production and trade total socioeconomic separation is not mandatory; a relative separation is quite adequate—the relative independence of the direct partners both of whom may be dependent on a certain superior economic entity. In a socialist economy this is an unquestionable fact. Being owned by society, the means of production are conditionally put at the disposal of reciprocally independent producers, who are not allowed to throw their way around in areas entrusted to someone else. That is why the necessary technical and economic changes in products and resources may be indirectly made through socioeconomic operations involving payment. The relative nature of the separation (the dependence of economic partners on the overall ownership entity) makes commodity production and exchange compatible with the planned management of socialist production.

The content of the separation which is manifested in the commodity features of a socialist economic management is not limited to the noninterference of the partners in reciprocal affairs. However, it presumes a status of the conditional managers in which access to the results of public production is made dependent on the amount of contribution to such results. Without rejecting the principle of economic management at the expense of society (since all production units manage the public property), such a socioeconomic form is an indication of certain restrictions. The freedom to handle resources and products for the sake of maximizing the overall national economic result is not complete. The level of well-being of the workers and production collectives is not determined exclusively by the size of such results. Therefore, commodity relations based on the principle of compensation are, in the different stages of development of the communist production method, historically transient elements of production relations, justified for as long as they are necessary in motivating production workers to do high-quality work, i.e., only under socialism.

Conversely, as the contemporary theory of efficient economic management has proved, commensurable economic values are the other side of any planning activity, characterizing the importance of the different products

and resources in terms of achieving desired results. That is why it is not the commodity-monetary mechanism (even in its planned aspects) that is a specifically communist regulator of public production but a broader category—planned management with the utilization of commensurate values. A planned socialist commodity economy is one of the varieties of the latter.

The groundless pitting of planning against commodity is explained by ignoring the complex internal structure of commodity relations themselves and the nature of the law of value which include functionally different aspects and different lengths of historically significant periods. One of them—the technical and economic—is determined by the need economically to correlate outlays with results. It exists in both commodity- and noncommodity-oriented economies. The Marxist classics emphasized that such commensuration will take place in a communist economy, in which there is no commodity output and value category; they linked economic "weighing" (the part which remains of the value) to the formulation of the production plan (op cit., vol 20, p 321). It is totally unrealistic to interpret the communist economy at its highest level of the division and combination of public labor as a commodity without evaluation and assume that it can do without summing up economic categories such as national income, overall production outlays, fixed and working capital, efficiency of capital investments, and so on, which cannot be elaborated without a specific commensurable value system. Linking the latter merely to the preservation of commodity relations means perpetuating them, ignoring the historically transient nature of their social content.

Unfortunately, all too frequently the acceptance of this concept was promoted to the level of theory and, frequently, of the practice of emphasizing the soonest possible elimination or restriction of commodity-monetary relations. Such concepts proved to be the ideological justification of the antisocialist practice of equalization, bureaucratic administration and neglect of cost accounting. The tremendous potential of commodity-monetary relations in terms of perfecting the socialist economy has been essentially used so far only to an insignificant extent, which makes relevant the task of their extensive development and the enhancement of the mechanisms of economic action.

#### IV

The need for a powerful center, responsive to the needs of the entire society, can be met only through its democratization, based on the development of ownership by the whole people and the principle of democratic centralism. The all-round democratization of social life has set restructuring as a priority task. The main economic advantage of socialist democracy is that as it enhances the sovereign functions of all members of society (developing a proprietary attitude toward public production and highlighting their organizational capabilities), it



yields direct economic results. Furthermore, the strong sovereign power of the working people is a prerequisite for improving the conditional-command activities of all administrative authorities.

Today democratization has become an economic need and a prerequisite for the upsurge of the national economy. It would be erroneous, however, to depict it as the application of a ready-made impeccable economic management mechanism. Improvements in this mechanism are based on the self-training of the working people in the course of the practical exercise of their sovereign rights. It will be the faster and the more successful the more tangible becomes the connection between economic changes and resolutions made directly by the people or their responsible representatives.

In addition to such "instrumental" usefulness, socialist democracy is a value unto itself (a value of a superior order), which brings to life one of the most important facets of the all-round development of the individual. Socialist humanism is incompatible with a situation in which the lot of the majority is simply one of performing.

The insufficient effectiveness of democratic institutions and low growth rates of output favored the dissemination of erroneous concepts according to which the essential advantages of socialism are expressed not in the enhancement of production efficiency on a higher level but exclusively in social guarantees (jobs, health care, education, etc.) which, in terms of economic consequences, more harm than help public production efficiency. This concept is rarely voiced openly. However, the prejudice that economic management cannot be improved if such guarantees are eliminated, and success cannot be achieved in the economic competition against capitalism without making use of specific production incentive mechanisms is quite widespread.

The concept that social guarantees which reflect a level of humanity of a given society are always inversely proportional to efficient economic management and hinders the stimulation of intensiveness and improvements in the quality of the work is groundless. Alternating socioeconomic systems raised to a higher standard not only labor productivity but also the freedom of the worker (transition from slavery to serfdom, a lighter form of dependency and its total elimination). Labor incentive methods such as power over the life of the worker, physical punishment and deprivation of the freedom of movement (in the past considered "normal practices") eventually vanished and if revived failed to enhance productivity. We are familiar with the major social guarantee brought about by capitalism, such as the freedom of the worker from personal dependence and civil equality which, to a certain extent, protected the workers from violations of contractual forms of exploitation. The leap in upgrading labor productivity, which was provided by capitalism, not only coincided in time with such processes but was largely their consequence. The labor-saving path of economic development, based

on the extensive use of machines and advancement of technology, is historically related to the fact that the exploiters were faced not by an obedient and suppressed manpower but by citizens with legitimate possibilities of standing up for themselves.

In enhancing the civil guarantees of the individual to a new level (the right to work), socialism eliminates a major obstacle to the technical and organizational progress of the production process, such as the resistance of the workers who fear to find themselves thrown out of the public production process and lose their social positions. However, the right to work does not mean that the worker is free to take a specific job only for the sake of his own pleasure and advantage. Access to any employment demands of performers (individuals and collectives) that they successfully cope with it (work according to ability) and that the job itself be socially useful. This justifies the dismissal of performers on all levels and the closing down of any "work place" (including entire enterprises and even economic sectors) should the results of their work stop being useful to society. However, alien to socialism are any forms of removing able-bodied people from participation in socially useful activities in general.

Chronic unemployment is not the inevitable companion of a highly efficient organization of the production process or the development of commodity-monetary mechanisms. Efficient economic employment regulators exist such as, for example, payments by producers for material and manpower resources allocated to them. Thus, increasing payments for assets, higher interest rates on long-term loans and reduced payments for labor resources stimulate the adoption of less material-intensive but more labor-intensive production methods. Changes in payments in the opposite direction encourage the release of workers. Such a method for economic control of material-labor ratios in production provides society with an instrument for controlling employment (the systematic layoff of workers and their involvement in production in other economic sectors).

The real reason for the inefficiency is found not in guarantees of employment but in the obsolete economic mechanism which encourages producers to engage in an unrestrained use of resources and to conceal production possibilities. In frequent cases official full employment becomes "unemployment" at the work place and to a certain extent wages into social aid. Such an outlay stereotype deprives payments for resources of their influence on production efficiency and on employment dynamics.

Mass chronic unemployment exists in the capitalist countries despite a substantial experience in centralized control, one of the main objectives of which, according to its ideologues, was to achieve full employment. In our view, the reason is not the helplessness of control instruments but the fact that full employment is not to the advantage of the capitalist class which makes use of mass

unemployment above all as a means of controlling the working class and constantly threatening the working people with dismissals. We neither can nor should compete with capitalism in terms of the strictness of mechanisms applied in motivating the people to work or not to work. The main advantages of our system are essentially different. They are related to its democratic and humane nature.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### **Nationwide and State Ownership**

18020006j Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 77-78

[Text] The articles by Doctor of Economic Sciences and Tallin Polytechnical Institute Professor Uno Mereste, published in the journal *KOMMUNIST ESTONII*, deal with problems of socialist ownership and the development of a proprietary feeling in the working people (U. Mereste, "Theory of Ownership and Perfecting the Economic Mechanism; "Theory of Ownership and Cost Accounting," *KOMMUNIST ESTONII*, No 5, 1987, pp 12-25; No 6, pp 31-40).

At the present time, the author notes, the internal contradictory nature of some concepts of the theory of ownership and the partial incompatibility between theoretical concepts and economic practice become obvious. Although everyone should be highly interested in the thrifty utilization of public property, in reality we note carelessness and negligence.

The feeling of ownership is particularly weak in the case of socialist ownership which is usually considered as belonging to the state or the whole people. In order to develop such a feeling, clearly, awareness of the fact that the plant where a person works belongs to him as much as all other enterprises do, is insufficient.

Public ownership of the means of production is the foundation of socialist production relations. This is a scientifically and historically proven fact. However, in terms of a rational and efficient organization of public production, such an abstract interpretation of socialist ownership relations is insufficient. The reasons for bad management, according to the author, are largely related to the abstract, both individual and collective, perception of the concept of ownership. We must concretize our understanding of socialist ownership relations and establish the connection between such ownership and the working people, which would be direct and tangible, and which would motivate every worker to act on the basis of the interests of society. Such an attitude must prevail not because people have been trained or ordered to do so but for the simple reason that acting thus and not otherwise is most beneficial to the worker himself.

In the final account, a true feeling of proprietorship can be developed only on the basis of ownership relations, realized by every individual, and materialized in the economic mechanism. The major shortcoming which developed in the economic mechanism at the beginning of the 80s was that ownership of the means of production by the whole people, although proclaimed, has not been implemented to the fullest extent. To most people it remains only a proclaimed principle which in reality is difficult to experience truly.

In his articles the author notes that this situation is explained by a variety of falsely interrelated reasons. The most serious among them is the fact that two different components of socialist ownership—by the state and by the whole people—have been considered to be one and the same in both theory and practice. The view that under socialist conditions these concepts are totally identical remains widespread in contemporary political economic publications. However, the concept of the identical nature of ownership of the state and the whole people would be correct only if one could prove that the state and the people are one and the same. Yet the people, or the population of any country, consists of all the people living in that country, whereas the state is a political organization consisting of specific institutions.

The socialist state performs a double function: first, it represents the entire nation (the society) and its interests in all areas of life, including as the owner of the means of production; second, it acts as an autonomous organization, i.e., as an integral system which, inevitably, has its own special interests.

In matters of ownership, the representative functions of the socialist state proceed from the fact that the basic means of production under socialism belong to the entire society, i.e., to all of its members jointly. Socialist society cannot act as the owner of its means of production without the intermediary role played by state organizations. The state acts on behalf of society in matters of ownership, use and handling of means of production. The fact that it represents society, which is the direct owner of all basic means of production, ascribes to its functions a clearly manifested economic nature. However, this is not to say that the state is their owner. However, in addition to representative functions, the state performs specific functions in terms of the organization of the political system. In particular, this includes administration, law enforcement, defense and other executive functions, the implementation of which requires certain material funds. Such funds are supplied by the nationwide ownership in the guise of property which, combined, forms the ownership by the state or state ownership. The latter includes also the means of production needed for the development of economic sectors closely related to the implementation of direct governmental functions (defense industry, communications, railroads, canals, air transport, etc.).

The consistent distinction between nationwide and state ownership is exceptionally important precisely now, in the period of profound restructuring and acceleration of the socioeconomic development of our society. Many discrepancies, which are usually acknowledged as isolated shortcomings of the economic mechanism, are in reality reduced to the contradiction included in the view that ownership by the whole people is the same as state ownership.

The elimination of this contradiction presumes changes in the theory of ownership and in the practical organization of production relations. In the theory of ownership this involves singling out four independent forms of ownership existing within the socialist society: by the whole people (which is determining and inherent only in the communist production method), the state, cooperative and private.

Private, cooperative and state ownership is today exercised in accordance with its essential features. So far, the principle of consistency has not been observed only in terms of ownership by the whole people. Ensuring such consistency, in the view of the author, is related to delegating the rights inherent in ownership by the whole people to the labor collectives which make actual use of it in the course of their production activities. In this case the strict preservation, for the benefit of the entire nation, of the right to prime ownership is basic.

The partial right to ownership of all equipment and other enterprise property should be granted to the labor collectives. This right should be sufficiently broad to ensure the latter's total economic autonomy. At that point each labor collective would act as the secondary owner of its enterprise.

The economic relationship between society and the state which represents it, on the one hand, and the secondary owner of means of production, the labor collective, on the other, must be regulated by taxes collected in amounts which are identical for all enterprises operating under the same conditions.

The prejudices concerning the meaning of ownership have led to an excessive overestimating of the possibility of broadening the economic responsibility of the socialist state and its obligations in the area of economic management. The first trend is manifested in the widespread parasitical moods: "The treasury is responsible for everything;" another is the unrestrained administrative zeal of managing authorities, underestimating economic methods and overestimating administrative ones.

The owner bears the responsibility: he pockets the income and suffers the losses. It is on the basis of this general economic principle that for decades excessive production costs were taken from of the pockets of the state.

The clear distinction between nationwide and state ownership indicates that the refusal of the state to compensate for the losses of cost accounting enterprises objectively stems from the essential differences existing between these two forms of ownership and the truth that the state is not the owner of the enterprise, for which reason it should not be responsible for its debts.

The exaggerated scale of the economic responsibility of the state and dependency are manifested also in the widespread view that the state should guarantee every worker his wage, regardless of whether or not the enterprise where this worker is employed produces goods which are of good quality and needed by the national economy or are not in demand at all. This approach is based on the simplistic understanding of the multiple-step production process in which allegedly every worker produces finished goods. In practice, the finished item and its parts and assemblies pass through the hands of numerous workers. If the entire enterprise personnel is accepted as the collective (secondary) owner, responsible for all outlays, it would become clear that the earnings of individual workers should depend on the income earned as a result of the sale of the end product. Consequently, every member of the collective is answerable not only for his own labor but also, indirectly, for that of his comrades. Hence his duty and his right to demand of everyone to work as well as possible. Indirectly, every worker is also responsible for the type of commodity which is being produced and the way the production process has been organized, for this determines his earnings and income as an owner. It is precisely such a dependence that constitutes the material foundation of the widespread development of a true feeling of being the owner and proprietor, enjoying all rights and bearing corresponding obligations.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

#### **Pace of Socialist Building; Thoughts of an Economist**

*18020006k Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 79-90*

[Article by Otto Rudolfovich Latsis, doctor of economic sciences; written on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the 15th Party Congress]

[Text] In December 1927 the 15th VKP(b) Congress adopted a document which was unusually innovative for its time and which, at the same time, had such a rich scientific and practical content as to have preserved its great importance to this day. This was the resolution "On Directives for the Formulation of the 5-Year Plan of the National Economy." Subsequently, virtually all party congresses adopted directives which included the foundations of the plans for the forthcoming 5-year period.

The directives issued by the 15th Congress were different. They contained virtually no figures or specific plan decisions. The resolution was a political directive of a scientific-methodical content, which provided the principles to be applied in undertaking the formulation of the plan itself.

For the first time in world history, an economically backward country, surrounded by a ring of enemies, was attempting to do something previously deemed impossible: to subordinate economic development as a whole to a state plan extending over a period of several years. The development itself was not consistent with the growth of output under peaceful conditions: the 5-year period included industrialization and a radical restructuring of the country's entire material and technical base and social structure. This makes even more interesting the assessment of the political and scientific standards of the resolution on the basis of today's viewpoint.

The first thing that strikes us is the idea of a national economic optimum, of an optimal plan which, even three decades after its publication, is judged innovative. This idea runs throughout the document. It was precisely on the basis of a line of optimal development that the problem of all strategic proportions was to be solved: between accumulation and consumption, industry and agriculture, heavy and light industry, etc.

The priority of strategic long-term interests and the rejection of the leftist idea of a "race" was adopted as an optimality criterion in all decision making. Thus, in rejecting the idea of the "one-sided interest of accumulation within a given time segment," the congress stipulated the following concerning the correlation between accumulation and consumption: "Taking into consideration the relatively contradictory nature of these features and their interaction and interconnection, which generally coincide from viewpoint of development, we must proceed from the optimal combination of both aspects."

Without rejecting the use of the assets of the countryside in developing industry but rather directly stipulating it, the resolution also cautioned that "it is erroneous to proceed on the basis of the demand for a maximal transfer of funds from agriculture to industry, for this would indicate not only a political break with the peasantry but also would undermine the raw material base of industry itself by undermining its domestic market and exports and disturbing the balance within the entire national economic system." Subsequent decades repeatedly confirmed the accuracy of this warning and to this day we feel the long-term consequences of having ignored it.

The approach adopted by the 15th Congress to the question of growth rates describes its economic strategy even more expressively: "In this case we must proceed not on the basis of a maximal pace of accumulation in

the next year or the next few years but of a correlation among the elements of the national economy which would ensure, on a long-term basis, the fastest possible pace of development."

Such a considered approach did not mean in the least the absence of clear priorities. Thus, the following was said about industry: "...To begin with, the production of means of production must be intensified...." In this connection, let us recall M.S. Gorbachev's report at celebration of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution: "The party offered an untrodden path of industrialization, not counting on outside sources of financing or waiting for many long years of accumulation as a result of the development of light industry, in promoting the development of heavy industry. This was the only possible way under the circumstances, although it was incredibly difficult for the country and the people."

Today the following is also of great interest to us: "...We must bear in mind the development of petty local industry, of artisans and craftsmen which, as an absolutely necessary supplement to large-scale state industry today, will contribute to the elimination of commodity shortages and would ease unemployment."

As we may see, already then, prior to the formulation and implementation of the very first 5-year plan, the 15th Congress had anticipated the many hard-to-cure "illnesses" which subsequently afflicted the planned economy of the USSR and some other countries, and had warned us about them.

The congress called for increased consumption, uninterrupted supplies to the market, strengthening the purchasing power of the chervonets, overall agricultural upsurge and fast agricultural industrialization.

The view on such industrialization is of interest. The resolution specified that "this must follow, above all, the line of the primary processing of agricultural commodities." At that time the development of industry in the countryside was urged on by manpower surpluses. The suggested course, however, not only reduced agrarian overpopulation but also solved a longer-range permanent problem, the significance of which remains obvious to this day. The strategic concept was that of the profound integration and proportional development of the different elements of what we know today as the agroindustrial complex. The development of processing industrial facilities in the countryside drastically enhances the overall efficiency of the entire complex.

Particular attention was paid to cooperatives. The detailed policy in this area included a specific congress resolution entitled "On Work in the Countryside." Noteworthy in the directives on the 5-year plan is the essential condemnation of efforts to hasten the development of socioeconomic processes: "In total contradiction with Lenin, who openly cautioned against the 'superindustrialization' viewpoint, and indicating the need to move

along with the entire basic mass of the peasantry, with thoughtless statements on 'peasant limitations,' the Trotskyite opposition suggests that we advance despite this mass, adopting in its entirety the thesis of 'limitations,' which Lenin mocked, and inevitably dooming party policy to failure."

The resolutions of the 15th Congress summed up the tremendous scientific and practical work, heated debates and sharp political struggle on the main problems of socioeconomic policy at the stage of industrialization, which had begun as early as 1925, i.e., on the eve of the 14th Congress. The problems themselves were placed on the agenda by the objective course of economic development. The postwar restoration of industrial output had been essentially completed by 1925. This had concluded the specific period of growth based on a somewhat truncated reproduction cycle, in the course of which the development of industry did not require major capital outlays: it was the enterprises which had stopped work during the war and dislocation years that were being recommissioned. On the other hand, the normalizing of economic life and the strengthening of the entire national economy in 1925 allowed the 14th Party Conference to eliminate the vestiges of "war-communism" measures in the countryside, lower the uniform agricultural tax and reduce the economic and administrative restrictions in the development of peasant farms.

The conversion from postwar restoration to industrialization raised the difficult problem of sources of accumulations needed to finance the forthcoming extensive capital investments. In turn, the scale of the necessary accumulations largely depended on the adopted pace of industrialization. Scientific work on this problem, carried out in 1924-1925, was based on the concept of strengthening the "merger" of the working class with the peasantry. The participation of the countryside in financing industrialization should not be such as to undermine peasant farming. This course was codified also in the resolutions of the 14th Party Congress which adopted the course of industrialization in December 1925.

The "new opposition," headed by Zinovyev and Kame-nev, opposed this approach adopted by the 14th Congress. It demanded an artificial acceleration of the pace of industrialization and, in this connection, the intensive extraction of funds from the peasant farms, including the use of coercive measures, under the banner of the struggle against the kulaks. At that time the greatest role in debunking their ideas was played by J.V. Stalin's political addresses and N.I. Bukharin's theoretical works, supported by most members of the party's Central Committee. The overwhelming majority of delegates to the 14th Congress resolved that the opposition's slogans were demagogic and its suggestions were rejected. After the congress the opposition leaders allied themselves with Trotsky and continued to defend their old ideas. Taking into consideration the anti-party

nature of the ideology and political behavior of the participants in the Trotsky-Zinovyev bloc, the 15th Party Congress expelled them from the party.

A study of the situation indicates that the economic policy essentially based on the Leninist principles was followed until the end of 1927: the alliance between the working class and the peasantry was strengthened, the establishment of a planned economy was paralleled by the development of cost-accounting and commodity-monetary relations, material incentive was improved and, the living standards of the working people were raised and stable and high rates of economic growth were combined with an orientation toward proportionality and economic balance. As had been the case in Lenin's lifetime, at that time the party rebuffed leftist demands of "rushing," of accelerating growth rates at the expense of violating economic balance and harming the social interests of the working people and the political consolidation of the society. The resolution adopted at the 15th Congress continued the tradition of planned and systematic development while preserving the economic and political balance.

What happened afterwards?

As we know, the 1st 5-Year Plan began on 1 October 1928 (at that time the economic year began in October). The 5-year plan had not been ratified as yet. The Gosplan completed its draft essentially on the basis of the directives of the 15th Congress. As was considered from the very beginning, two variants of the plan were drafted: functional and optimal. Initially, there were no political differences between the variants. It was simply considered that some factors (harvest, foreign trade and the foreign policy situation) could not be precisely forecast. G.M. Krzhizhanovsky, the chairman of the USSR Gosplan, said in his report to the 15th Congress: "We must act like an artilleryman: we must bracket the field of fire and earmark two points or, as they say, two variants. The first is the close and cautious assessment of a certain minimum of economic opportunities which will ensure, above all, the uninterrupted development of the economy. That is our functional mark, our functional variant. The other set of figures takes into consideration more favorable opportunities which, under certain conditions, would enable us better to implement our targets. The fact that this optimal variant cannot be implemented in full is no catastrophe." If the plans of the 15th Congress could be implemented with an average annual growth rate of industrial output of about 16 percent, while the functional variant called for approximately 18 percent, the optimal variant demanded a pace of 20-22 percent. That which, according to the optimal plan, was to be accomplished in 5 years would take about 6 years with the functional plan.

Subsequently, however, the functional variant began to be increasingly referred to as minimal, opportunistic and hostile. The Sovnarkom began to recommend the optimal variant exclusively. In April 1929, at the 16th Party

Conference, and on the basis of the reports submitted by A.I. Rykov, Gosplan Chairman G.M. Krzhizhanovsky, and V.V. Kyubyshev, chairman of the VSNKh, unanimously spoke out in favor of the optimal variant as being the only possible and acceptable. The fifth Congress of USSR Soviets adopted the 5-year plan, the basic indicators of which were consistent with the resolutions of the conference. In subsequent resolutions of the Central Committee, the Sovnarkom and the USSR TsIK the plan indicators for pig iron, petroleum, tractors, agricultural machinery and other types of output were increased. This was followed by the slogan of "The 5-Year Plan in 4 Years!" and the annual plans became increasingly accelerated. Thus, at a report to a TsIK session on the control figures for 1931, V.M. Molotov, the new Sovnarkom chairman, reported that the plan called for an increased industrial output by 45 instead of 22 percent, as stipulated in the 5-year plan for the third year of the period. Soon afterwards, J.V. Stalin explained in one of his speeches that in terms of the main sectors this will mean the implementation of the 5-year plan in 3 years. In January 1933, in a report submitted to the Joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission of the VKP(b), he announced that the 5-year plan had been fulfilled; 1932 became the final

year of the 5-year plan (by then the beginning of the economic year had been moved to 1 January). This meant that the 5-year plan lasted 4 years and 3 months.

Stalin's report to the joint plenum mentioned only two figures: he reported that the program for the overall volume of industrial output had been fulfilled 93.7 percent and 108 percent for heavy industry. This was a question of value, of gross indicators which, by their very nature, are inevitably arbitrary to a certain extent. This arbitrariness and approximation becomes the greater the more the production structure changes in the course of the period under consideration. However, it is precisely our 1st 5-Year Plan that is a unique case in world history of breaking down the industrial structure in a large country. In 1932 entire sectors which did not exist in 1928 were generating output: the automobile, tractor, petrochemical and other. Virtually all other sectors in the processing industry had been reorganized and begun to produce new goods. Such a structural transformation in itself emphasizes the historical significance of industrialization. However, if we wish to determine the accuracy of the specific planned decision and the way it was implemented we cannot rely on such general value indicators. Physical indicators as well must be studied in order to find a more complete and more accurate answer (table 1).

Table 1.

Industrial Production During the First 5-Year Period

| Commodity  | Assignments for the Last Year of the 5-Year Period, Earmarked at the 16th Party Conference and 5th Congress of Soviets | Subsequent Increase in Assignments | Actual 1928 Output | Year of Actual Implementation of Plan Indicators | Initial | Increased |
|--|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|---------|-----------|
|  |  |                                    |                    | Actual 1932 Output                               |         |           |
| Electric Power, million kilowatt hours               | 22   | —                                  | 5.0                | 13.5   | 1935    | —         |
| Coal, million tons                                   | 75   | —                                  | 35.5               | 64.4   | 1933    | —         |
| Petroleum, million tons                              | 22   | 45-46                              | 11.6               | 21.4   | 1934    | 1952      |
| Pig Iron, million tons                               | 10   | 17                                 | 3.3                | 6.2  | 1934    | 1950      |
| Chemical Fertilizers in Standard Units, million tons | 8  | —                                  | 0.1                | 0.9  | 1954    | —         |
| Tractors, thousands                                  | 53   | 170                                | 1.3                | 48.9   | 1933    | 1956      |
| Steel, million tons                                  | 10.4   | —                                  | 4.3                | 5.9  | 1935    | —         |
| Rolled Metal, million tons                           | 8  | —                                  | 3.4                | 4.4  | 1935    | —         |
| Iron Ore, million tons                               | 19.4   | —                                  | 6.1                | 12.1   | 1934    | —         |
| Motor Vehicles, thousands                            | 100  | 200                                | 0.84               | 23.9   | 1935    | 1937      |
| Combines, thousands                                  | 0  | 40                                 | —                  | 10   | —       | 1937      |
| Cotton Fabrics, million meters                       | 4,700  | —                                  | 2,678              | 2,694  | 1951    | —         |
| Woolen Fabrics, million meters                       | 270  | —                                  | 86.8               | 88.7   | 1957    | —         |
| Paper and Cardboard, thousand tons                   | 900  | —                                  | 331.6              | 544.2  | 1936    | —         |
| Refined Sugar, thousand tons                         | 2,600  | —                                  | 1,283              | 828  | 1951    | —         |

The first six lines are sectors which were considered particularly important at that time. The resolution of the 5th Congress of Soviets concerning the 5-year plan states the following about them and about two other value indicators (general and agricultural machine building): "The congress instructs the government to pay particular attention to and to keep under its observation the production assignments included in the plan, which are decisive for the socialist industrialization of the country...." As we may see, not one of these six assignments (and of the other assignments cited in Table 1) was fulfilled in 1932. Assignments for two sectors were fulfilled in 1933, roughly within the time earmarked in the initially approved 5-year plan (i.e., the optimal variant). The remainder were fulfilled in 1934 (which was roughly according to the functional variant) or even later.

By any historical standard this was not a brilliant result. In no country has capitalist industrialization ever reached such a pace despite the fact that the development of industry in all large capitalist countries was based on external financing sources (plunder of colonies, loans, reparations) and took place under favorable foreign political conditions. The achievements of the land

of the soviets made a particularly staggering impression against the background of the Great Depression in the rest of the world. Taking this into consideration, contemporary historical studies must provide an answer to other questions as well. Could even higher economic results have been achieved? Could the social cost have been lesser? How did some decisions influence the results of the 5-year plan and the entire economic standard which was created as a result of abandoning the methods used during the NEP?

All the indications are that the initial intent of the Gosplan ("bracketing" the functional and the optimal variants) was essentially realistic, at least as far as the quantitative dimensions of the 5-year plan were concerned. However, when the stressed variant was replaced by an arbitrary fantastic pace included in the annual plans, a breakdown followed. Disproportions arose which, after an insignificant increase, led to a drastic decline in growth rates. The overall result of the "leap" with its decline, compared with a possible systematic development was, unquestionably, lower, as confirmed by table 2.

Table 2.

Growth Rates of Industrial Output (in percent)

|                  | Year Within the Five Year Plan |        |       |        |       |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
|                  | First                          | Second | Third | Fourth | Fifth |
| Starting Variant | 21.4                           | 18.8   | 17.5  | 18.1   | 17.4  |
| Optimal Variant  | 21.4                           | 21.5   | 22.1  | 23.8   | 25.2  |
| Annual Plans     | 21.4                           | 32.0   | 45.0  | 36.0   | 16.5  |
| Actual           | 20.0                           | 22.0   | 20.5  | 14.7   | 5.5   |

The sharp decline in the pace in 1933 is particularly noteworthy. That was to be the last year of the first 5-year period. However, following the statement that the plan had been fulfilled ahead of schedule, 1933 became the first year of the second 5-year period.

The "leap" with its subsequent decline, which took place in 1930-1933, was the first but, unfortunately, not the last attempt of its kind. Subsequently such events occurred at different times and in different countries, so that by now the mechanism of this process is quite well known. It is usually based on the disproportionality between major investments in building new enterprises.

It soon becomes clear that they are not consistent with the construction capacities, possibilities for the procurement of materials and equipment and the development of the infrastructure, transportation and power above all. The time for the completion of the numerous initiated construction projects has to be extended and the funds invested in them yield no returns. Nor is there any commodity backup for the wages paid to construction workers. A commodity hunger appears, followed by inflation and, as its consequence, either a price increase or rationing. Both took place during the first 5-year period. This was the only case in our history in which rationing was introduced throughout the country not as the consequence of a war but in peacetime.



Disproportions and disturbances in material procurements are closely related to production disorganization, idling, lowered quality of labor and increased outlays. The growth of labor productivity in industry during the 5-year period turned to be significantly lesser than planned and the growth of the average annual wage much higher. On the one hand this was the result of violations of proportionality; on the other, it was the reason for new disproportions. It was no longer a case of significantly lowering production costs which, taking into consideration the initial stress of the plan, was considered the most important source of accumulation and a mandatory prerequisite for the implementation of the plan.

Let us recall that as early as 1926, in the course of the debates on industrialization, when the leaders of the opposition called for pressuring the peasantry, the party countered their demand with a different plan. It was suggested that outlays in industry be reduced through rationalization, savings and limiting bureaucratism, and increasing accumulations and, at the same time, increasing the procurement of commodities for the countryside in order to obtain more grain both for the cities and for export. Despite difficulties, this course was essentially followed in 1926 and 1927. The 15th Congress as well supported this policy and relied on it. The first "leap" of 1929-1930 dealt a double strike at this policy: first, the planned accumulations in industry were not achieved; second, the question of commodities for the city appeared, for the growth of industry was ensured not only by increasing labor productivity but also by increasing the number of employed people and the faster growth of wages. All that was left was either to stop industrialization or obtain additional resources by increasing the extraction of funds from farming and limiting consumption by the urban population. Thus the rates and methods of collectivization were directly related to the rates and methods of industrialization. The realistic pace of collectivization, which had been earmarked by the 15th Congress, and which was the base of the assignments of the 5-year plan, was reviewed at that time (and just as radically) as were assignments for industry.

The study of the methods applied for collectivization and their sociopolitical results exceed the limits of this article. We shall consider only the basic production results of the 5-year plan in agriculture which, unquestionably, were affected by the social consequences of the applied collectivization methods (table 3).

Table 3.

**Agricultural Production in the First 5-Year Period**

|  | 1928  | Year<br>1932/33<br>(based on the<br>5-year plan) | 1932<br>(actual) |
|--|-------|--|------------------|
| Total area in crops,<br>million hectares         | 113.0 | 141.3  | 134.4            |
| including areas in<br>grain, million<br>hectares | 92.2  | 111.4  | 99.7             |
| <b>Gross harvest,<br/>million tons</b>           |       |  |                  |
| grain  | 73.3  | 105.8  | 69.9             |
| cotton   | 0.79  | 1.91   | 1.27             |
| sugar beets                                      | 10.1  |  | 6.6              |
| <b>Yields, quintal per<br/>hectare</b>           |       |  |                  |
| grain  | 7.9   | To be increased                                  | 7.0              |
| sugar beets                                      | 132   | by   | 43               |
| cotton   | 8.1   | 35   | 5.9              |
| flax   | 2.4   | percent  | 2.0              |
| potatoes   | 82    |  | 71               |
| vegetables                                       | 132   |  | 79               |
| <b>Cattle, million<br/>heads</b>                 |       |  |                  |
| horses   | 32.1  | About 38   | 21.7             |
| cattle   | 60.1  | 80.9   | 38.3             |
| including cows                                   | 29.3  | 35.5   | 22.3             |
| hogs   | 22.0  | 34.8   | 10.9             |
| sheep  | 97.3  | ...  | 43.8             |
| <b>Output</b>                                    |       |  |                  |
| meat, million tons                               | 4.9   | ...  | 2.8              |
| milk, million tons                               | 31.0  | ...  | 20.6             |
| wool, thousand<br>tons                           | 182   | ...  | 69               |
| eggs, billions                                   | 10.8  | ...  | 4.4              |

We should bear in mind that considerable attention was paid to the indicators of agricultural production only in the formulation of the 5-year plan. In correcting its assignments in terms of the countryside, the emphasis was on the pace of collectivization. The 5-year plan called for the collectivization of about 20 percent of the area in crops. As early as 1929 this level had been reached and by the end of the 5-year plan collectivization had been essentially completed in the main areas. It was

precisely this result that was noted by Stalin at the joint January 1933 plenum. Stalin did not mention the production of agricultural commodities, which had declined.

Let us repeat what is common knowledge: all countries need industrialization; it is doubly needed by a country which has taken the path of building socialism and needed three times as much because of the hostile encirclement of the socialist state, the only one of its kind at that time. It was also dictated by the short time available for building a heavy industry, including a defense industry. Victory in the Great Patriotic War would have been impossible without the historical feat of the people which had preceded it: industrialization. The study of the problems which appeared on the way to industrialization makes this truth, repeatedly confirmed by reality itself, unquestionable. The question lies elsewhere: were the methods requiring the lowest or, conversely, the highest costs for industrialization chosen? Related to this is a question which is particularly relevant today: the origin of the negative aspects of the type of planning and economic standard which developed in the 1930s and 1940s, aspects which restructuring must now eliminate.

M.S. Gorbachev's report on the period of industrialization states that along with historical accomplishments it created losses as well: "There was belief in the universal efficiency of rigid centralization and the fact that command methods are the shortest and best way for the solution of any problem." When did this belief appear and how did it gain the upper hand?

Let us remember that the period from restoration to industrialization was earmarked by the 14th Congress, as early as 1925. Had the objective logic of such a conversion been dictated by the need for an artificial acceleration of the growth and for "leaps," such a change should have been mandated at that same congress, the more so since it was demanded by some influential leaders ("the new opposition"). The congress clearly rejected this path. Here is an excerpt of its main resolution on Stalin's report: "We are faced with an *economic offensive* mounted by the proletariat on the basis of the new economic policy...." The congress called for "developing our socialist industry on the basis of higher technical standards but strictly in accordance with the capacity of the market and the financial possibilities of the state."

In the section which discussed work in the countryside, in condemning the two deviations (underestimating and overestimating the struggle against the kulaks), the 14th Congress stipulated: "The congress particularly emphasizes the need to struggle against the latter deviation. With a relatively better preparedness by the party for a direct struggle against the kulaks and the elimination of the first deviation, the elimination of the second becomes a much more difficult task, for the elimination of this deviation demands more complex means of struggle combined with methods of political isolation of

the kulaks by involving the bulk of the peasantry in building socialism, the more so since under present-day conditions the second deviation threatens a return to the policy of eliminating the kulaks and the collapse of the party's current line in the countryside, a line which has already led to major political successes, a collapse of the process of merging the proletariat with the peasantry and, perhaps, a collapse of our entire building project." This text of the resolution reiterates the corresponding stipulations included in the Central Committee political report presented by Stalin.

The 15th Party Conference (1926) included the following in its resolution: "The national economy is entering a period in which its pace of development is greatly slowed down in comparison with the previous years. The defeatist ideology manifested in the speeches of the opposition, which links this with a slowdown in the pace the failure of industrialization and a threat to the dictatorship of the proletariat, is entirely wrong. This ideology does not take into consideration the fact that the development of industry on the basis of the expansion of basic capital (new capital construction) never could nor could now be as fast as the development of industry on the old basis during the final years of the period of restoration."

The considered stipulation of the 15th Congress on the pace has already been mentioned. Who could have sufficient power to change within a short time the established party line? The answer is clear. That is why it is important to consider Stalin's statements on the pace of economic growth and that of socialist reorganization.

The work "*On the Foundations of Leninism*" (1924) describes the main tasks of building socialism: "It is hardly necessary to prove that the implementation of all such assignments within a short time, in no more than a few years, is totally impossible." One year later, in the report "On the Results of the Proceedings of the 14th RKP(b) Conference," Stalin noted the objective factors which "dictate a less painful albeit longer way of involving the peasantry in building socialism and of building socialism together with the peasantry." He indicated the need "to eliminate the vestiges of war communism in the countryside." He described as "meaningless blabbering" appeals to "encourage the class struggle in the countryside." He claimed that "the main thing now is to get together with the mass of the peasantry, to enhance its material and cultural standards and to move ahead along with this mass on the way to socialism." He proved that it is through cooperatives—crediting, agricultural, consumer and artisan—that "slowly but thoroughly the peasant farm must become part of the overall system of building socialism" (let us note "slowly but thoroughly"). Finally, he called for "the communists in the countryside to abandon distorted forms of administration. One should not simply issue orders to the peasantry. One must learn patiently to explain to the peasants problems they do not understand. One must learn how to convince the peasants, sparing neither time nor efforts to accomplish this."

In the report he submitted at the 14th Party Congress (December 1925) Stalin opposed any acceleration of capital investments in industry: "This would constitute the type of fast pace of development of industry which we would be unable to maintain...." He warned that "in the future the development of all industry will, in all likelihood, not keep such a fast pace as it has been keeping so far."

Here is an excerpt from the report "On the Economic Situation of the Soviet Union and the Party's Policy" (1926): "The same could be said about the pace of our accumulations and reserves at our disposal for the development of our industry. Occasionally we love to formulate fantastic industrial plans regardless of our resources. In some cases the people forget that it is impossible to formulate industrial plans or various 'extensive' and 'all-embracing' enterprises without a certain minimum of funds, without a certain minimum of reserves. The people forget this and start rushing ahead."

At the 15th Party Conference, Stalin said that the opposition bloc is "taking... the path of 'superhuman' leaps and 'heroic' invasions in the field of the objective course of things. Hence... the demand to industrialize our country in just about 6 months, and so on. Hence also the adventurism of the policy of the opposition bloc. In this connection the theory of the opposition bloc becomes particularly important (the Trotskyite theory) of leaping, with the help of the peasantry in our country, in the matter of our country's industrialization...." In that same report Stalin supported Rykov's claim that what is taking place is not the "dissolution" of the middle peasant but, conversely, his strengthening, by significantly reducing extremes, i.e., the kulaks and the poor.

On 5 November 1927, in a talk with foreign worker delegations, Stalin said: "We are planning to promote collectivism in agriculture gradually, through economic, financial and cultural-political measures. I believe that the most interesting matter is that of economic measures." He spoke quite clearly of the "all-embracing collectivization" during that same talk: "Matters have not reached that point and will not reach it soon." Let us note the date: November 1927.

The 15th Party Congress met the following month. The accountability report cited the growth rates of the national income: 29.9 percent in 1925/26, 11.4 percent in 1926/27, and 7.3 in the 1927/28 plan. Undisturbed by the decline, the speaker commented on these figures as follows: "**The growth rates of the national income of the USSR in recent years is record setting** compared to the big capitalist countries in Europe and America." He then quoted figures showing the growth of industrial output for the same 3 years: 42.2, 18.2 and 15.8 percent. The projections of the Gosplan for the next 5-year period were quoted: a 15 percent average annual increase in large-scale industrial output and 12 percent for industry as a whole. The conclusion, as assessed by Stalin, was

that this would be a "record-setting percentage" and an "unparalleled pace." He was right. The 40 percent increases of the restoration period could not remain a steady norm. Development based on the full cycle of expanded reproduction of a 12 percent of annual growth was a brilliant indicator.

Two more weeks passed. On 15 January 1928 Stalin traveled to Siberia. In city after city he summoned to conferences the party aktiv. The purpose was not to explain such profound and considered documents of the recently ended 15th Congress. He sharply criticized the local workers for their unwillingness to use exceptional measures against the kulaks and to apply Article 107 of the RSFSR criminal code. At that point he put on the agenda "developing the building of kolkhozes and sovkhazes." This was not to be a long-term project but a step directly related to a current measure: the grain procurement campaign. This was 2 months after his statement at the talk that this was not "a matter for the immediate future." This was also less than a month after the 15th Congress, which had earmarked an entirely different approach.

It is important to note that the minutes of the January 1928 speeches in Siberia were published for the first time as late as in 1949 as part of Stalin's collected works.

Another 6 months went by (no more than half a year!). In his 9 July 1928 speech at the plenum of the VKP(b) Central Committee, Stalin said that the peasantry "will pay to the state not only the usual taxes, direct and indirect, but will also **overpay** a relatively high price for industrial commodities, first, and would more or less **undeharge** prices for agricultural commodities, second. This meant an additional tax imposed on the peasantry in the interest of promoting industry which services the whole country, including the peasantry. This was something like a "due," something like a supertax which we are forced to collect temporarily...." Stalin then attacked "some comrades" who demanded the introduction of the "restoration prices" for grain, i.e., prices which would compensate for production outlays. Therefore, the suggestion was to force the peasantry to sell its bread at a loss, at below-"restoration" prices. This was a step aimed not only against the kulaks, but also against the entire peasantry, for the price was the same for everybody. It was a departure from Lenin's New Economic Policy and a direct violation of the resolutions of the 15th Party Congress. Article 107 applied to refusal to sell grain at a loss. The peasant uprisings caused by the exceptional measures could be answered with military force. For the following year, however, the peasants were bound to reduce the areas in crops. What was the answer to this?

This plenum speech as well was published for the first time only 21 years later, when no one dared openly to criticize the leader, and also when there were few people who even questioned his infallibility. It was only then that, for the first time, the speech he had delivered at that

same plenum 2 days later, was published. It showed, first of all, that some participants at the plenum (unnamed) did not agree with the principle of a "due" and the rejection of restoration prices and, second, that they themselves had rejected restoration prices. The names of those people who supported this position at the plenum and the reason for which they eventually retreated cannot be found without delving into the archives.

On the day which followed the closing of the July plenum, Stalin delivered a speech to the aktiv, which was immediately published in the press. It demanded the "immediate" end to the "survey of farmyards, illegal searches and all kinds of violations of revolutionary legality," and the immediate stop to "all and any recurrences of the tax in kind and any attempt at closing down marketplaces," as well as a "certain increase in grain prices (no mention was made of restoration prices). It was thus that biased initiatives were proclaimed in a public speech and rejected in "closed" speeches.

Was it accidental or was it because of good information that Trotskiy, who at that time was not only already expelled from the party but also in exile in Alma-Ata, attacked in an open letter the resolution of the July plenum on the partial lifting of the state of emergency?

At that time, N.I. Bukharin came out in PRAVDA with the article "Notes of an Economist." He criticized the concept that the peasantry was getting richer, for which reason it was no sin to rob it, and that grain should be procured through exceptional measures without raising prices. Bukharin noted that, yes, the income of the peasants has increased. However, this was unrelated either to grain growing or grain prices. The income of the peasants was growing as a result of seasonal work, i.e., not as a result of farming but of industry and construction. The grain economy was weakening, which threatened to undermine industrialization itself. The peasants were encouraged to work in the cities where, as it were, there was unemployment, and were not encouraged to grow grain. It was equally wrong was to emphasize the role of the kulaks, for it was not they who engaged in seasonal work. Initially, Stalin did not respond to this article. It was only at the start of 1929, in a speech at the joint session of the Central Committee Politburo and the Presidium of the VKP(b) Central Control Commission (published for the first time 20 years later) that he said that the article "Notes of an Economist" was an attempt to "correct" the Central Committee line.

In the course of the following 18 months the rejection of the stipulations of the 15th Congress concerning the pace of industrialization and the pace and means of collectivization was manifested even more firmly. The criteria of the accuracy of the party policy themselves were reviewed. As early as 1928 Stalin said (quite sensibly) that if after taking the grain from the peasants by force the size of the crops remained the same it meant that there was no serious discontent among the peasantry. In 1929, however, he said the opposite: the areas in crops

have been reduced, which meant that exceptional measures were needed. The fact that the reduction of crops and even the uprising of the peasants in Adzharia was described as a "insignificant petty matter," was proof that no major policy correction was required.

The growing economic and sociopolitical imbalance could not fail to worry many party members. The famous articles "Dizziness From Success" and "Answer to Comrade Kolkhoz Members" (March and April 1930) were received by them as a long expected return to a more sensible policy. However, Stalin did not wish such a turn and saw to it that this was understood by the leading cadres, as confirmed by the "Answer to Comrade M. Rafail" (May 1930):

"1. There neither is nor could there be **any** analogy between the Central Committee action of March 1930 against breaks in the kolkhoz movement and the Brest period, or the period of introduction of the NEP. At that time it was a matter of a change in policy. Now, in March 1930, no policy turn whatsoever existed. We merely called to order comrades who had gone too far...

"2. A change in policy on matters of the kolkhoz movement (in connection with the turn of the masses of the middle peasantry toward kolkhozes) indeed occurred but not in March 1930 but in the second half of 1929."

This was not only an indication that the extensively publicized article of 1930 did not mean a real turn in policy but also an admission of the change which had taken place in 1929, i.e., the abandonment of the entire policy of "coupling," which had been formulated by Lenin.

This letter as well was not made public by Stalin at that time. He sent a copy of it to S.M. Kirov.

One month later, in his reports to the 16th Party Congress, Stalin praised the "frantic pace" of industrial development and approved the possibility of the implementation of the 5-year plan "for an entire number of industrial sectors in 3 and even in 2.5 years." He called for an even greater acceleration of the pace of development of industry and, finally, said: "People who blather about the need to **lower** the pace of development of our industry are the enemies of socialism and agents of our class enemies."

He himself started mentioning the need to lower the pace two and a half years later, when the destructive effect of the "leap" had become obvious and its continuation, dangerous. In his report at the joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission, in January 1933, he said that the main tasks in laying a base for a new modern technology and enhancing the best capability had already been implemented. "After this, is it worth it to urge the country on? It is clear that this is no longer necessary." He suggested for the

2nd 5-Year Plan average annual growth rates of industrial output of 13-14 percent. It is true that by that time the 17th Party Conference had already adopted the control figures consistent with the previous "leap" course. In 1934, however, the 17th Congress adopted directives which had essentially nothing in common with the resolutions of the conference. The 17th Congress formulated quite high but entirely realistic objectives, as confirmed by the overall successful implementation of the 2nd 5-Year Plan.

However, a different economic mechanism, the mechanism of limited cost accounting, had already been established. It is indicative that it is precisely in the mid-1930s, with a return to a more proportional development, that the aspiration to revive cost accounting methods intensified. This was manifested particularly clearly in the then famous experiment at the Makeyevka Metallurgical Plant, where a variant of brigade cost accounting was extensively applied. People's Commissar G.K. Ordzhonikidze paid great attention to these and other experiments. He ended them in 1937, after which they were forgotten because of the war.

Historians cannot ignore the question of the reasons for the abandonment of the Leninist principles of socialist development along a number of lines, which took place toward the end of the 1920s. This is a topic for a special study which exceeds the limitations of an article. It is clear that such a broad turn cannot be explained only in terms of the negative personal features of the leader. Nor can such features explain the support which was given to Stalin at that time by the majority of the leading party stratum. It was a reflection of the objective features of the social psychology of the age and, above all, the revolutionary intolerance of the young working class which was hurrying from a state of backwardness to one of a worthy life.

A reference to these objective circumstances does not indicate a justification of Stalin, for a leader must look farther, aware of and understanding the moods of the masses, as exemplified by Lenin. This does not imply a condemnation of the rank and file people of that time, for they could not know what we know today. In recreating history on the basis of documents, we must try to see it through the eyes of those who lived it. Such a life, in addition to impatience and increased expectation of people who had had a taste of historical creativity, included the depressing feeling of constant foreign threat. Clashes at various borders, ultimata, and diplomatic nonrecognition all triggered the desire to create at all cost prerequisites for victory in the inevitable future clash.

The increased pace of economic growth was, at that time, a matter of life or death for the young socialist country. Practical experience, however, proved that in order to achieve a real increase in the pace it was not necessary but was even harmful to "urge the country on." Reality proved the reliability of Lenin's stipulation of planned

and proportional development, which was reflected also in the resolutions of the 15th Party Congress. Loyalty to the Leninist principles was confirmed by successful development if observed and failure if violated.

The lower the functional level in the development of a country which has made a revolution is, the bigger becomes within it the stratum of the young proletariat and semi-proletariat, which easily yields to pseudorevolutionary appeals and adventuristic promises of implementing quickly tasks which demand long years of persistent effort. The more social strata tend toward a "revolutionary" impatience, the greater becomes the responsibility and objective role of the political leader who must keep the country on the right course. Lenin not only implemented this task in his clashes with the "leftist communists" of 1918 and in the conversion to the NEP in 1921, but also indicated to the party the tremendous importance of the personal features of the leader and the unity of leadership in such matters. This was the topic of his "Letter to the Congress." At a different time Stalin was either unable or unwilling to implement such a task.

The question of the pace of development has always been among the basic. However, under contemporary conditions, the criteria governing its solution have changed. It is necessary, above all, to accelerate scientific and technical progress and to increase labor productivity, to renovate fixed capital and output and to increase the efficiency of public production.

As we implement such tasks today, we do not forget that the possibility itself of contemporary development is predetermined by industrialization and socialist reorganization in the national economy. At the same time, we need a close and objective study of the past in order to solve the new problems more reliably.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

#### **Choice of a Road; KOMMUNIST Roundtable Meeting**

*180200061 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 91-99*

[Roundtable meeting of KOMMUNIST, the CPSU Central Committee journal, NAMYN AMDRAL, journal of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee, and KOMMUNIST KIRGIZSTANA, Kirgiz Communist Party Central Committee periodical]

[Text]The picture of tremendous changes which have taken place in the destinies of mankind under the influence of the October Revolution becomes clearer when looked at from the height of its 70th anniversary. A

vivid fragment of this overall picture is the implementation of Lenin's idea of the possible conversion of previously backward peoples to socialism, bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

The experience of the nations which have covered such a distance is of tremendous importance. Its further interpretation is dictated not only by the imperatives of the contemporary global liberation process but also the requirements of social practice of these nations themselves, the more so since a detailed study of recent decades clearly reveals an emphasis on avoiding problems and simplistic and schematic concepts concerning the complex and occasionally conflicting stages of socialist change based on pre-bourgeois social relations.

Objectively, from the Marxist positions of scientific historicism, without avoiding difficulties and omissions, to assess the experience of noncapitalist development, refracting it in terms of the present and the future, was the task set by the participants in the debate which took place in Frunze, gathering for a roundtable meeting representatives of the three party journals and social scientists from the Soviet Union and the Mongolian People's Republic.

The roundtable materials were prepared for publication by S. Kizhnyakov, KOMMUNIST associate, with the help of D. Parchukov, KOMMUNIST KIRGIZSTANA associate.

K. Moldobayev, secretary, Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, who opened the meeting, described the topic of the discussion as one of the most interesting in social science. We know how many different views exist in this area although, naturally, by no means is everything always presented on a sufficiently high scientific level.

After completing the transition from feudalism to socialism, the peoples of a number of Soviet republics and the Mongolian people realized, through their own experience, how difficult but also how efficient is the way they have chosen for their sociopolitical, economic and spiritual progress. Our achievements are universally known. However, we would consider ourselves bad Marxists if, in analyzing the past, we look exclusively at positive features and ignore the errors and omissions which occurred. Today we must daringly plunge into the deep strata of reality and reach new levels of scientific knowledge. Without this no accurate conclusions can be drawn or lessons learned for the future. This is made necessary by the developing process in the revolutionary renovation of socialism, which is bringing to light a number of "sensitive spots" in the social sciences and providing a powerful impetus for the intensified and all-round study of the post-October age, including the features of noncapitalist development.

### Theoretical-Methodological Aspect

*The victory of the Great October Revolution marked the beginning of the socialist reorganization of the life of dozens of ethnic groups in Siberia, the Extreme North, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the Northern Caucasus, the Volga area and a number of other areas of the former tsarist empire and, subsequently, of the people of Mongolia. What new features were introduced through such practices in the theory of this problem and the methodology for its study?*

N. Khmara, head of sector, Institute of Marxism-Leninism, CPSU Central Committee, doctor of philosophical sciences:

The experience which was gained not only offered clear proof of the tremendous opportunities and advantages which opened to the liberated peoples advancing toward socialism, while bypassing capitalism. It proved that the revolution under feudal conditions and sometimes at even earlier stages of social development cannot replace in one fell swoop the socioeconomic system which has prevailed in that society for hundreds and hundreds of years.

We must acknowledge that in our literature the processes of the noncapitalist way of development were frequently presented simplistically, lacking the proper study of all the difficulties and contradictions of the transitional period. Yet it is precisely the way problems are solved, difficulties surmounted and errors corrected that makes the practical and theoretical value of the variety of experiences of progress toward socialism.

The acquired experience proves the prime importance of taking into consideration the specific nature of socioeconomic conditions under which a transition takes place from pre-bourgeois to socialist forms of social relations and the priority nature of the radical restructuring of the economic life of backward nations. The complex problems in this area include the appearance and assertion of forms of ownership, replacing feudal or semi-feudal systems, and leading toward socialism. It is a question of the establishment of a cooperative and nationwide ownership as a process which demands a certain time. In this connection the use of private property, excluding the exploitation of man by man, and the correlation between private and public ownership are of definite theoretical interest.

In summing up practical experience we must also take into consideration subjective errors, manifested in efforts artificially to hasten socioeconomic processes without a comprehensive assessment of actual possibilities. As reality has proved, the aspiration to skip necessary stages on the way to socialism and rushing ahead without a suitable economic base are fraught with a number of negative consequences. Errors of this nature were made in the 1920s and 1930s by our party and in the MPRP.

The solution of social problems is particularly important. Thus, for example, in the struggle for socialism, in frequent cases nomad livestock breeders, extremely scattered by virtue of their way of life and nature of their work, had to be involved in the struggle for socialism. This situation was most prevalent in people's Mongolia in the course of developing a national working class. Matters in the eastern portions of our country were somewhat different. In a number of areas a working class had already been developed. Essentially, however, it consisted of people who had come from the central parts of Russia.

The organization of collective labor is one of the very important problems in understanding the nature of the distance which was covered. Under essentially feudal conditions, not to mention a nomadic way of life, no broad foundations for the development of such type of labor exist. Taking the socialist way presumes using a variety of methods for its development.

The national problem is among the most difficult problems in the study of the processes of transition of previously backward peoples to socialism. In a multinational country we must maximally take into consideration the specific nature of national relations, and the ruling Marxist-Leninist and vanguard parties must pay constant attention to them. The nationalism of an oppressed nation—its democratic aspect—could be used in the struggle against colonialism and imperialism. However, as Lenin cautioned, such a “defensive” nationalism frequently becomes aggressive. The elimination of nationalistic prejudices is an extremely difficult matter which demands steady and painstaking efforts in all areas—economic, sociopolitical and ideological. Recurrences of nationalism prove the danger of weakening such efforts. Yet in some publications which came out in Central Asia as late as the spring of 1987, it was claimed that everything in our country involving national relations was as it should be and that essentially they involved no contradictions whatsoever. We believe that the time has come to undertake a comprehensive, intensified and, above all, realistic analysis of the state of national relations which make corrections in the theory and practical work in this area.

**S. Norovsambu**, director of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law, corresponding member of the Mongolian People's Republic Academy of Sciences:

As confirmed by the historical experience of various countries, including Mongolia, the noncapitalist way to socialism goes through two main stages, those of democratic and socialist change. Despite their differences, they are not divided by an unbridgeable gap, for they constitute different degrees of a single process, the transition to socialism.

The study of the specific experience of nations which have attained socialism while bypassing the capitalist

stage, and the trends noticed under contemporary conditions in the Asian and African countries which have taken or are taking a noncapitalist way, allow us to single out typical features and patterns inherent in such development.

In politics this means setting up a people's revolutionary party which has adopted the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, ensuring its leading role in the life of society, establishing and strengthening the state of revolutionary-democratic dictatorship by the toiling people and its growth into a state of dictatorship of the working class, strengthening political independence and sovereignty, democratizing sociopolitical life and the state apparatus and extensively involving the working people in management.

In economics this means the elimination of precapitalist relations and promoting democratic agrarian change, eliminating the economic domination of imperialism, achieving the economic independence of the country from foreign capital, creating and strengthening state and cooperative socialist economic sectors, establishing the public ownership of basic means of production and creating a socialist industry.

In the socioclass area this means shaping a national working class and gradually strengthening its leading role in all areas of social life, training a new people's intelligentsia, strengthening the close alliance between the working class and the toiling peasantry and the other toiling strata, eliminating the feudal and exploiting class, restricting and eliminating private-capitalist elements by exposing the working people to contemporary socialist civilization, and the acquisition of broad social rights by the working people.

In the spiritual and ideological area this means the revival of national culture and intensification of its progressive traditions, democratization of culture, elimination of widespread illiteracy, organizing a unified public education system, ensuring broad access to the achievements of contemporary culture, science and art, and making socialist ideology dominant.

In the area of international affairs it means relying on the fraternal aid of the first country of victorious socialism, the USSR, and broadening all-round cooperation with the other socialist countries, establishing close ties with the international communist and worker movements, and steadily strengthening such relations on the basis of the principle of proletarian internationalism; pursuing a systematically peaceful foreign policy.

**Question:** *Let us establish the following: are the concepts of “noncapitalist way of development” and “transition to socialism, while bypassing capitalism,” synonymous?*

**N. Khmara:** It could be said that essentially these concepts coincide, for both mean progress from feudalism to socialism. Within the framework of this movement,



however, there are certain nuances and differences. We are familiar with a number of forms of such development within which differences exist as well.

**S. Norovsambu:** Specifically, we could single out several varieties of the noncapitalist way of development of previously backward peoples and countries advancing toward socialism. The first is the road covered by a number of republics in the Soviet Union within the framework of a single multinational socialist state.

The second is the noncapitalist development achieved by the Mongolian People's Republic with the help of countries in which socialism has won.

The third is building socialism in individual countries with the help of the members of the global socialist community. This is exemplified by Vietnam and Laos.

The fourth variety is the noncapitalist development of a number of young and independent countries in Asia and Africa.

**A. Geldiyeva,** head of the department of philosophy, Uzbek Republic Pedagogical Institute of Russian Language and Literature, candidate of philosophical sciences:

In studying the overall laws and specifics of the anti-imperialist liberation revolutionary movement in Eastern countries, Lenin invariably and firmly condemned any attempt at a mechanistic confusion between socialist and pre-socialist noncapitalist social changes. The transitional socialist forms are related to the period during which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established. It is within the framework of these forms that general democratic changes, which are closely interrelated and interdependent with socialist changes, assume such a profound nature that they objectively lead to a transition to socialism. The leading role in this revolutionary process belongs to the working class, headed by the Marxist-Leninist party.

Transitional presocialist noncapitalist forms may be found in contemporary countries with a revolutionary-democratic system. In such countries specific forms of noncapitalist relations appear (such as semi-governmental and private-state enterprises, communal-cooperative farms, etc.). In a contradictory way they combine a great variety of elements of traditional and contemporary features and means of production which are either on their way out or in. Naturally, they prepare conditions for progress toward socialism but cannot radically change the qualitative state of a transitional society with a socialist orientation. It is a question not of the new forms themselves but only of their prerequisites. However, even they are able to change the previous structures of power, ownership and entire way of life, opening the way to new and progressive features. Whereas the transitional socialist forms create prerequisites for socialism, transitional presocialist forms prepare the prerequisites

for a transition to the socialist way. These two types of transitional forms are not identical but nor are they conflicting. They are in a state of dialectical interconnection.

The dialectics of the transitional forms under noncapitalist development is such that, as the revolution grows elements with a socialist content within them gradually increase. These are not separate forms of independent significance. Their content is contradictory and transitional, as is the society itself to which they correspond. This is greatly determined by the degree of maturity reached by the working class and its influence on revolutionary processes. The stronger it is, the more emphatic become the elements of a socialist content within the transitional forms.

#### Sociopolitical Aspect

*Let us cite above all, among the general laws governing the transition of previously backward peoples to socialism, the political leadership of the masses provided by the Marxist-Leninist party. How is it manifested? The establishment of socialism, while bypassing capitalism, intensifies the gravity of problems, such as the inadequacy of the working class stratum, stability of tribal and clan relations, etc. What are, on the basis of existing practical experience, the essential features and trends of socioclass changes, combined with the processes of national consolidation?*

**B. Ligden,** editor in chief of the MPRP Central Committee journal NAMYN AMDRAL:

The importance of political leadership can be determined quite accurately on the basis of the Mongolian experience. From the very first days of the people's regime, the party undertook to make revolutionary changes. Guided by Lenin's recommendations and relying on the aid and support of the land of the soviets, it created and strengthened a political organization of society consistent with the new system. Considerably outstripping the level of development of the economic base, the social infrastructure and production forces, such an organization provided conditions for the advancement of the basic structures.

The MPRP formulated and implemented a general line of progress at each stage in the transition from feudalism to socialism. It defined the ways and means of achieving objectives, making extensive use of the experience of the Soviet communists and mobilizing the Mongolian people in surmounting difficulties and errors. By the turn of the 1960s our party had won a full victory: the conversion of the country from feudalism to a socialist stage of development had been completed.

On its way to socialism, Mongolia had to cross a number of intermediary stages in revolutionary changes, which lasted some 40 years. Although during that time the foundations were laid for a new system, the tasks of laying its material and technical foundations was not implemented.

It is precisely completing the laying of the foundations of socialism that the MPRP considers an additional stage in the development of the country on the way to building socialism, an element partially or entirely absent in the European socialist countries. Both now and in the immediate future, completing the building of socialism in Mongolia is the essence of all activities of the party and the people.

Taking into consideration the level reached in socialist development and the objective factors which influence it, the 19th MPRP Congress formulated a course of accelerated progress by Mongolian society. Its essence is the dynamic development and further growth of the country's economic potential.

Under contemporary conditions the role of the MPRP assumes new features and rises to a new standard. The laying of the material and technical foundations for socialism, the gradual conversion of the country into an industrial-agrarian state and economic intensification must be completed under its leadership. Greater importance is assumed by a scientifically substantiated policy aimed at the acceleration of socioeconomic progress in connection with the need to bring closer the levels of development of Mongolia to those of economically leading socialist countries and the comprehensive identification and utilization of the advantages of socialism and all possibilities offered by socialist economic integration.

The increased leading role of the party in building socialism is determined to a decisive extent by the influence of subjective factors: organizational structure, level of activeness of intraparty life and methods of party leadership. In other words, it ensures the development of the party itself, its democratization, upgrading the combativeness of its organizations and the ability to efficiently influence social processes and the shaping of new relations.

It can be said, based on the experience of the MPRP, that the theory of the party of the working class of a new type and its leading principles are consistent not only with the nature of the proletariat and its party but also with that of the revolutionary-democratic parties which have appeared in backward countries in which a national working class either does not exist or is virtually absent. The experience in the development of our party, we believe, could be of use to the revolutionary parties of the liberated countries in Asia and Africa.

**Question:** *Are there difficulties in MPRP ideological activities? Does a problem concerning religion exist in present-day Mongolia?*

**B. Ligden:** We are encountering a great deal of difficulties in our ideological work. For example, the question of glasnost is pressing. As to religion, that problem has not been entirely solved although the number of strong believers is declining with every passing year.

**S. Norovsambu:** At the beginning of the revolution, in some cases the party made use of the religious movement, considering the influence of the Bogdykhan (the supreme monk) on the popular masses. After 1924, however, atheistic work was intensified. It took place in the course of an acute struggle against the opposition within the party, which preached a certain "community of ideas" between scientific communism and Buddhism.

**M. Suzhikov,** head of the department of scientific communism, Kazakh SSR Academy of Science Institute of Philosophy and Law, doctor of philosophical sciences:

I would like to discuss the difficulties of a transition from the level of medieval peasantry to contemporary civilization and scientific and technical progress. What is the situation, for example, with labor training, labor discipline and quality of labor? Capitalism has its own system by instilling fear of unemployment and so on. Socialism will not accept such means. We proceed from the factor of conscientiousness in the organization of efficient work. However, leading to it toiling masses in previously backward countries is much more difficult than leading the working class. We paid little attention to this problem and the consequences of this attitude can be felt to this day.

It is only now that we have started a major discussion on training skilled ethnic cadres in the Central Asian republics. Until now we primarily looked at the central parts of the country, expecting that specialists will come from there. The development of the virgin lands was undertaken 30 years ago. Every year, however, the crops in that area are harvested by about 20,000 combine operators from the outside.

Nor have the errors of the earlier stages in the transition to socialism vanished without a trace. At that time, for example, orders were issued to "eliminate" the nomad way of life, ignoring age-old traditions and the need for gradual change. We did not properly analyze such errors and frequently ignored them. Yet it is extremely important to approach cautiously the features of the national mentality of one nation or another. No stereotype is acceptable in this case.

Today we show concern for the fact that so far the national detachment of skilled workers in industry is still quite insignificant and complain of low labor discipline, the quality of output and moods of dependency. Is this not one of the consequences of that certain "fast leap" with the help of which we tried to "move" yesterday's medieval peasant to the age of contemporary scientific and technical civilization? This is on the one hand. On the other, for a while we began to forget the conclusion

based on Marxist-Leninist theory: that unless we combine properly the international (general-socialist) and national-specific factors in the course of practical work, the result may disturb the "functioning" of the mechanism of national mentality, as a result of which it begins to develop national egotism, boastfulness and exclusivity instead of internationalism. That is precisely what happened in Kazakhstan, which led to the familiar December events. This is not astounding, if we consider the weakness of the national detachment of the working class, which is the main bearer of internationalist principles in the life of the people, and the extensive practice of favoritism, enhancement of tribal relations and neglect of ideological activities which, until recently, could be noted in the republic.

Social scientists and workers in literature and the arts bear a great deal of responsibility for this. It was with their help that the prerevolutionary nomad society was praised far and wide. Some people ignored history to such an extent that they began to describe the areas of the Syr Darya as the "cradle" of human civilization and wrote books on the determining significance of tribal divisions among Kazakhs. Meanwhile, the contemporary processes of ethnic and interethnic relations in the republic remained virtually unstudied.

Adding to this muddy water the element of bourgeois nationalistic propaganda, introduced into Kazakhstan by foreign ideological centers and radio stations, it becomes clear how all this influenced the national self-awareness of young people.

**Question:** *Let us determine, in connection with the viewpoint you presented, the following: could a Kazakh or Kirghiz socialist nation fully develop without a sufficiently large nucleus of an ethnic working class? How are vestiges of tribal divisions influencing the consolidation of a national awareness? Finally, in your view, could the concept of "national economy" be applicable to a union or an autonomous republic?*

**M. Suzhikov:** The industrial detachment of the working class is justifiably known as the nucleus of the socialist nation. In terms of its level of skill, organization, awareness and scope of thinking, it plays a vanguard role in social development. All of this is confirmed by sociological studies as well. For that reason we cannot fail to be concerned by the fact that within such a detachment working Kazakhs are so far quite insignificantly represented. Furthermore, hitches in the orientation of some Kazakh young people have begun to appear. Some of them have spent not a single day of work in production. They do everything possible to enroll in a VUZ; finding a "profitable" job has become the main concern of others. If young people go to work in a plant, mine, construction project or industry, it is mostly where, through intensive physical efforts, they could stuff their pockets with money faster, after which they leave.

Unfortunately, the notorious equalization and decline in the prestige and wages for highly skilled labor have played a substantial role in such aspirations.

The answer to the second part of this question is simple. Naturally, a tribal division and the promotion of one family as opposed to another, divides the nation and leads to regional, oblast and republic claims to leadership. An uncompromising struggle must be waged against this. The sooner the nation eliminates internal clan barriers the stronger and more mature it becomes and the more efficient becomes its contribution to the socioeconomic development of our common socialist fatherland.

As to the national economy: yes, there is a union-wide and unified national economic complex in our country, of which the economy of each republic is an organic part. That is why we are justified in speaking precisely of the national segment of this complex, although in this case we must mandatorily bear in mind that it was created through the efforts and the toil of all nations and ethnic groups inhabiting a given republic and the country at large.

**Question:** *We say that the process of noncapitalist development in Mongolia and in the union republics of Central Asia has been completed. However, the consequences of the past are still being felt. Does this mean that it is somewhat unfinished?*

**R. Achilova:** In my view, the Mongolian comrades have developed a more realistic periodization of the path of noncapitalist development by stating that in Mongolia it was completed essentially in the 1960s. Soviet social scientists are somewhat shortening the periods of time which our peoples took to cross the stage of noncapitalist development, equalizing them and periodizing the laying of the foundations of a socialist society in the USSR as a whole.

**K. Nurpeisov,** department head, Kazakh SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography, doctor of historical sciences:

I believe that we should not ignore the role which the peasant soviets and the mass peasant organizations play in the process of transition to socialism, bypassing capitalism. The building of soviets in the national countryside in Kazakhstan and Central Asia began with the very first days of the victory of the socialist revolution in the area, as a structural component of socialist changes in the country at large. The aul and kishlak soviets did not immediately become the true authorities of the state of workers and peasants. They crossed a lengthy and complex path of development from local administrative authorities which, in their early stage, were penetrated by many representatives of the bays and their agents, to becoming the true agencies of the dictatorship of the proletariat, headed by the Communist Party. In other words, in the first years of the Soviet system, consistent

with the transitional and mixed-system nature of the region's economy and the tasks they had to implement, the aul soviets, as a superstructural element, also displayed some transitional features.

In developing the local primary authorities and the aul cells of mass peasant organizations, based on Lenin's instructions, the party took into consideration the real correlation among class forces, the significant influence of vestiges of tribal ideology and the patriarchal-feudal way of life on the peasant masses. Thus, in the period of consolidation of the Soviet system and for a while after the civil war, with a view to freeing small and weak families from their dependence on larger ones in some parts of Kazakhstan (as well as in Kirghizia and Turkmenia) the creation of aul soviets and local cells of mass peasant organizations based on clan features was allowed.

From the very first days of the victory of the socialist revolution and, particularly, under the conditions of the conversion to the NEP, the Communist Party, the Soviet system and their local authorities ascribed tremendous importance to the process of settling the nomads, considering this one of the important prerequisites for the conversion of the Kazakh people from precapitalist relations to socialism. Lenin's Decree on the Land was a crucial event in solving the problem of a settled way of life. This process not only included solving problems of an economic nature but also affected complex problems of state and national policy, culture and ideology.

The peasant soviets deserve a great deal of credit in the matter of the restructuring of the social nature and spiritual aspect of the broad masses of the native populations in the area, the elimination of illiteracy and the exposure of the ethnic rural population to culture. They made a major contribution to the international upbringing of the toiling peasantry.

In the course of building socialism, the party found more flexible ways, means and methods for sovietizing auls and kishlaks, implementing national policy and bringing the state apparatus closer to the toiling masses. This was the purpose of the activities of specific institutions adapted to the conditions of a nomad and semi-nomad aul life, such as the red caravans of the KazTsIK and the guberniya executive committees, and red yurtas of uyezd and volost soviet executive committees. They included members of party and state agencies, physicians, teachers, and lawyers, moving from one village to another, engaging in comprehensive political-educational work and accomplishing a great deal of good in involving the toiling Kazakh peasantry in building socialism. Any spot where people would gather was used in promoting political education: fairs, weddings and even Muslim holidays and wakes.

#### **Economic Aspect**

*Socialism is inconceivable without an adequate material and technical production base. What are the aspects of shaping socialist economic structures among previously*

*backward nations? What are the reasons for stagnation phenomena in their economies and what are the possibilities of accelerating their socioeconomic development?*

**R. Gongor, NAMYN AMDRAL editor:**

The liberation of the peasants from serfdom, the nationalization of the land, the elimination of feudal class privileges and the taxation of feudal farms with a progressive income tax were the first serious blows which the people's regime inflicted on the system of feudal production relations. Major revolutionary undertakings aimed at undermining the economic power of the feudal lords included the confiscation of the cattle of the laic feudal rulers and the partial expropriation of monastery property.

A difficult struggle was waged to eliminate the economic domination of foreign commercial-usurious capital. Enslaving debts owed to foreign merchants and usurers were annulled; a national currency was introduced; currencies of other countries were removed from circulation; foreign companies were taxed; the foundations were laid for state and cooperative trade; a domestic financial-crediting system was established and close economic relations with the Soviet Union were organized and expanded. Soviet-Mongolian shareholding societies in various economic sectors played a major role in restricting foreign capital.

The development of peasant cattle breeding farms took place on the basis of clear-cut class principles, through a policy of taxation. The poor peasants were either entirely freed from taxes or benefited from major tax benefits. The main wedge of the tax policy was aimed at limiting and restricting the farms of the feudal lords and the monasteries. This was achieved through the systematic application of a progressive income tax.

Strengthening the socialist system in the national economy by organizing a state and cooperative economic sector was an important aspect in the struggle for economic independence and noncapitalist development of the country. In laying the foundations for construction, industry, transportation, agriculture and other economic sectors directly on a socialist basis, the national state had to surmount major difficulties caused by the lack of sources for capital investments and of specialists and experience in organizing such work. The help provided by the Soviet Union was particularly important in solving all of these problems.

Completing the establishment of production cooperatives in the peasant farms in 1959 was a political and economic victory in building socialism. The petty commodity sector was eliminated on the basis of a cautious long-term systematic policy of promoting socialist cooperatives. One of the features of the reconstruction of Mongolian agriculture was the fact that it was completed

before the industrialization of the country was established on a broad scale. Another feature of cooperativization was the fact that it took place without the elimination of the kulak class.

The course which the MPRP charted toward industrialization led to profound structural changes. The fuel and energy complex and the ore mining industry are being developed at a faster pace. The role of industry is increasing in the country's economy. The share of its net output in the national income has increased from 15 percent in 1960 to 33 percent in 1985; it will reach 36 percent by the end of the current 5-year period.

In terms of many indicators which showed substantial progress in industrialization, Mongolia has already outstripped countries in Asia and Africa with which only recently it shared the same socioeconomic level of development. The pace of national economic growth in the republic is higher than that in most other socialist countries. However, the volume of the gross social product and the per capita national income, labor productivity and other basic indicators remain significantly lower. That is why it is so important to accelerate socioeconomic progress and to upgrade public production efficiency.

**Question:** *What problems and difficulties present themselves along this way?*

**R. Gongor:** A great deal remains to be done to enhance the still low efficiency of capital investments and fixed capital in the national economy. In the past 10 years capital returns in the national economy have declined by 15 percent while material intensiveness has increased by 17 percent. The conservation of materials, fuel and energy, the processing of secondary raw materials and the use of wasteless technology are the most important tasks of the present.

**B. Ligden:** Our crucial problem is that of improving planning. In this respect we are still behind the fraternal socialist countries. However, an active discussion of this problem is already underway and we hope that it will yield results.

**T. Koychuyev,** deputy director, Kirghiz SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Economics, doctor of economic sciences:

For a long time evaluations of the economic development of the republic in the Soviet East suffered from one-sidedness: successes alone were noted, while real contradictions and shortcomings were ignored. Today, when we are solving problems of acceleration, no profound study has been made as yet of the shortcomings which are caused by the legacy of the past and those resulting from the cost of modern developments.

For example, our republic, as the rest of the country, urgently faces the problem of accelerating the technical modernization of industry. It has been estimated that this must be accomplished faster by a factor of 3.5 compared to the present. The question is the following: is the lagging in the updating of productive capital related to the level of the historical base from which we started with the institution of the Soviet system or is it the result of an unskilled approach to the present problems? The clarification of this question would enable us to make better substantiated practical decisions.

Of late the party has persistently emphasized the inadmissibility of moods of dependency. The question is why did they appear? Clearly, their sources should be sought in the failure promptly and thoroughly to analyze a number of socioeconomic processes and to put into effect the mechanism for upgrading the efficient functioning and economic responsibility of each republic for the state of affairs. In frequent cases the help which was given unwittingly assumed the nature of philanthropic charity which, naturally, did not contribute to the elimination of dependency.

The time has come objectively to evaluate the current possibilities of union republics and also clearly to define the tasks related to equalizing their development. In particular, this is related to the question of training a national detachment of the working class. The deployment of production forces, not only in the large but also in the small and medium-sized cities is of great importance in this connection, in order to bring production closer to areas with high manpower availability.

**Question:** *What can be said of the historical experience gained from the industrialization of our republic?*

**M. Malabayev,** head of the CPSU History Department, Kirghiz State University, doctor of historical sciences:

The creation of a modern industry in a previously backward area such as Kirghizia involved specific difficulties. Initially, priority was given to light industry. This was determined, first of all, by the fact that the republic had adequate amounts of agricultural raw materials. Second, although Kirghizia was rich in minerals and energy resources, on the basis of which the building of heavy industry enterprises could have been developed, these possibilities were poorly studied at the initial period of industrialization.

The feature of the industrialization was that Kirghizia relied on the comprehensive aid of the RSFSR and the other fraternal Soviet republics. It was precisely thanks to such aid that between 1926 and 1937 we built more than 110 large industrial enterprises, which enabled us to increase the basic production assets in state industry by a factor of 16.5. The pace of Kirghiz industrial growth was higher than that of the Soviet Union as a whole.

In the initial years of socialist industrialization, the ranks of the working class in the republic were largely reinforced on a spontaneous and uncontrolled basis for, although temporarily, there was unemployment in the country. Starting with 1931, when unemployment was totally eliminated, the organized recruitment of workers was undertaken by concluding contracts between enterprises and kolkhozes. Another channel for increasing the detachment of workers was the transfer of farmhands from the private-individual to the state-socialist sector of the national economy, including plants and factories. Furthermore, as in other republics, skilled workers from the central areas of the RSFSR and the Ukraine were assigned to Kirghizia.

**Dzh. Baktygulov**, head of the department of Kirghiz history, Kirghiz State University, doctor of historical sciences:

I would like to mention the historical experience of collectivization based on the example of the nomad Kirghiz aul. For a number of reasons, it started initially by organizing TOZ as a transitional stage to agricultural cooperatives. At the same time, there was a planned and mass conversion of nomad and semi-nomad farming to a settled way of life. The process of conversion to a settled life was completed in Kirghizia in 1940.

During the period of socialist reorganization of agriculture the question of the most acceptable forms of providing organizational and technical services to the collective farms became particularly pressing. This was done through the machine-horse and machine-hay mowing stations which subsequently developed into machine-tractor stations. They actively contributed to the development of the production forces of the aul and to strengthening the alliance between the working class and the nomad peasantry.

**M. Moshev**, interim director, Institute of History, Turkmen SSR Academy of Sciences, candidate of historical sciences:

The roundtable meeting participants have already touched upon a number of most important problems of agrarian change as the main component of the transitional path of previously backward peoples from feudalism to socialism. I would like to discuss the role of land and water resources in this process.

The vestiges of the land colonization policy of tsarism in Turkmenia were eliminated as a result of the 1921-1922 reform; the local and the Russian settled peasantry were given equal rights to land and water use. Nonetheless, the reform contributed to the intensification of class stratification in the aul. In the course of such stratification a mass organization of the toiling peasantry appeared—the Koshchi alliance, which became the support of the party and the Soviet system. The second land and water reform was carried out in 1925-1927. It put a definitive end to the patriarchal-feudal forms of land and

water relations and created favorable prerequisites for the socialist reorganization of agriculture. The development of irrigation made it possible to resettle thousands of peasants who were either landless or had little land, from different parts of the republic to newly developed irrigated land. This broke down the traditional tribal barriers and increasingly families and tribes mixed, which contributed to the consolidation of the Turkmen socialist nation.

The agrarian changes which were made in the 1920s provided conditions for the development of various forms of cooperatives, agrarian in particular, which played an important role in establishing the transitional relations to socialism. Historical experience in building socialism has shown that cooperatives are the most successful form of gradual exposure to socialism not only for the Russian peasantry but the Turkmen as well.

**Question:** *The roundtable participants frequently emphasized the decisive role of other nations in the transition of previously backward peoples to socialism. What corrections is present-day reality introducing in this factor?*

**L. Lebedinskaya**, senior scientific associate, CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, candidate of historical sciences:

Today the problem of the attitude toward the noncapitalist development of nations is related to that of shaping a new style of political thinking, abandoning the old customary style and developing an awareness of present historical realities. In our time the problem of the socialist orientation of economically backward nations merges with the problem of the unification of all class-heterogeneous forces and trends which are internationally active in the preservation of peace.

To the nations of many developing countries, where natural disasters, hunger, poverty and disease are raging, physical survival (in addition to the overall nuclear threat) is, for this reason as well, the most important problem. We must also take into consideration that at the present stage in human history the socialist states do not have the kind of wealth which would allow them to provide more efficient aid to the populations of underdeveloped countries in order to surmount their poverty and backwardness. Furthermore, in the socialist world itself, including in the Soviet Union, the problem of providing the population with everything necessary on the level of a high standard of civilization, which is precisely what will eventually prove the historical advantage of socialism, remains as yet unsolved.

As far as we, social scientists, are concerned, we should be more realistic in assessing the levels of development of the different social systems. However, the simple recognition of the need to re-evaluate our accomplishments is insufficient. Science must earmark real prospects for social progress.

In terms of the noncapitalist stage of development within the framework of the Soviet state, it would be accurate to speak of its unquestionable completion together, however, with a preservation of vestiges which are manifested whenever deviations from the principles of socialism are permitted to occur. In this connection, it would be expedient to consider in a new way, more profoundly and objectively, the contradictions existing during the noncapitalist stage and determining the consequences of the errors and blunders committed in order to take measures to correct the developed situation.

#### From the Editors:

The problem of the choice of ways of social development is one of those which require intensified work and, at the present stage, research of a new quality. It is no longer sufficient to note that progress along a noncapitalist way is a natural process in the post-October revolution age. It is important to identify the entire depth and complexity of problems related to "shortening" the transition to socialism, bypassing capitalism. This is a difficult task, for it does not relieve a given nation of the need to set up a material-production and spiritual-cultural foundation consistent with socialism. It demands a more or less lengthy period of time, based on specific conditions, for the ripening of material and cultural prerequisites for socialism and for carrying out "presocialist" changes.

However, even with the successful solution of such problems many apparently eliminated difficulties and contradictions remain within the social structure, "concealed," so to say. Phenomena of stagnation in the economic and social life of some areas and "residual" phenomena could be considered to a certain extent as the results of structures which have settled profoundly within society along with traditions inherent in presocialist and precapitalist systems. Could it be that the psychological inertia of "dependency," which was discussed at the roundtable meeting is not also largely a consequence of a "shortened" way of development? Problems, as we may see, do exist and should be the subject of close attention.

On the eve of the Great October Revolution, in assessing the future of socialism, Lenin wrote: "We are familiar with the direction of this path. We know the class forces which lead along it but in terms of specific and practical terms this will become apparent only through the experience of millions of people, when they undertake to do this work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 34, p 116). In formulating in Leninist terms the task of following the noncapitalist way, we could say as follows: now, when the social practical experience of millions of people has laid this path and Marxist-Leninist science has enriched our familiarity with it, it is the duty of the social scientists creatively to develop and increase this knowledge, critically to interpret the tasks, soberly to assess the present and realistically to look at the future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**A Writer's Fate in the Destiny of the Country**  
*18020006m Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18,*  
*Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 100-109*

[Article by Vadim Ilich Baranov, doctor of philological sciences, professor at Gorkiy State University]

[Text] In the study of the history of literature we, philologists, most frequently describe works of art, literary groups and trends and the manifestoes they issue. But what about the individuals who wrote those works, who drew up the manifestoes, who joined groups and, above all, under the influence of what circumstances did they act one way and not another, what did they "accept" from these circumstances immediately or with difficulty and what was it that they opposed? All of this seems to be of very little interest to us. Those who prefer to plunge into the structure of an artistic text are totally uninterested in it.

In the field of art the creative individuality of the artist is of truly tremendous importance, perhaps more than in any other area. However, the artist creates not only through the power of his talent but also on the basis of the specific circumstances which surround him.

That is precisely what I intend to discuss and what is a topic of consideration: it is the complex path of the artist in a revolution and the conflicting circumstances which, in art, can be specifically identified. I would like to describe a few people who had the opportunity to play a major role in the creative life of A.N. Tolstoy, during the period when he was forced to make his way with tremendous difficulty across the mounds of social contradictions.

I shall begin with the fact that on 14 April 1922 A. Tolstoy published an "Open Letter to N.V. Chaykovskiy." This was proof of the demonstrative break of the writer with the White emigres, which preceded his return to Soviet Russia at a time when some literary workers, conversely, were leaving Russia for foreign lands.

This letter to Chaykovskiy is a most interesting document of Russian social thought, for which reason it is well known by lovers of literature but almost unknown to the readership at large.

N.V. Chaykovskiy (1850/51-1926) is not even mentioned in the multiple-volume history of the USSR. However, since in the history of the populist movement the term "Chaykovists" has been established quite firmly, the authors have had to explain it. This, however, was done only in the fine print, as a footnote: "Name was given to a federation of a number of circles named after



N.V. Chaykovskiy (a noted leader of revolutionary populism and subsequently an SR and a White emigre), although he was neither its founder nor particularly influential leader."

This may be obvious to the specialists and I hope they will not be insulted by the following assumption: does such a characterization which I would consider retrospective, show a certain one-sidedness? Actually, paradoxes in historical development are frequently such that by the will of fate a person may undergo a major conceptual transformation in one or, sometimes, another, opposite direction. One-sidedness of evaluations is not the best way of interpreting the entire complexity of the situation.

N.V. Chaykovskiy, who was born into a family of the nobility, graduated from Petersburg University in 1872 and plunged headlong in revolutionary-propaganda work. As Petr Kropotkin certifies, initially "the circle had nothing revolutionary about it" (Kropotkin was a member of the circle). The Chaykovists, however, began to distribute clandestine publications in a number of cities. They began to unite and gradually became one of the centers for socialist propaganda among young people.

"Our circle remained a close family of friends. Subsequently, I never came across such a group of ideally pure and morally outstanding people as the 20 persons whom I met at the first meeting of the Chaykovskiy circle," writes Kropotkin in his "Notes of a Revolutionary." Suffice it to say that it included S. Stepanyak-Kravchinsky, Sofiya Perovskaya, who was executed in 1881 for an attempt on the life of Alexander II, and others...

N.V. Chaykovskiy spent more than 30 years in foreign exile and returned to Russia in 1906, as an SR. At age 60, during the period of reaction, he withdrew from political activities. Suddenly, however, it was as though he had gained a second breath. In February 1917, N.V. Chaykovskiy became active and a member of the Central Committee of the People's Socialist (Labor) Party, the program of which, as Lenin said, was a switch of the "SR program, from revolutionary to opportunistic and petit-bourgeois legal" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 14, p 44).

Indeed, revolutionism in Chaykovskiy's views diminished more and more while his aspiration to be at the head of events increased further and further. The depreciation of his "leftist" views was made totally clear after the October Revolution, of which he became a consistent opponent, heading the puppet government in Arkhangelsk.

Way back, at the dawn of his youth, he "went to the people," and tried to promote what was sensible, good and eternal. Eventually, he gained power. Under his "rule," thousands of people were executed or died of hunger, were tortured in the "death camps" on Mudyug

Island and the Iokanga Peninsula. As we know, the intervention collapsed. All that was left for Chaykovskiy was to share the fate of his allies and to flee Russia. It was thus that he found himself in Paris (as did A. Tolstoy).

At that time Chaykovskiy was already 70 years old. However, he had no intention of retiring from social activities and he headed the executive bureau of the committee for aid to emigre writers in France. In 1920 he began to publish the monthly literary, political and scientific journal GRYADUSHCHAYA ROSSIYA (a significant title!).

A. Tolstoy actively participated in the organization of this publication. I found in the library of West Berlin several letters by A. Tolstoy written to professor Yashchenko, who was involved in publishing activities in Berlin. On 9 December 1919, A. Tolstoy wrote about his intensive work on the novel "Purgatory" (the initial title of his novel "Sestry" [Sisters]). The publication of the novel was begun in the first issue of GRYADUSHCHAYA ROSSIYA. Actually, it was the main content of that issue. In addition to Tolstoy's work, the issue carried unpublished works by Pushkin, a programmatic article by Prince Lvov entitled "Our Tasks," and, finally, an article by that same Chaykovskiy "Our Path to Healing." What kind of path was this former Narodovollets dreaming about? His statement was quite unequivocal: "Suppression of the Bolshevik rebellion by force of arms cannot and must not be halted."

At that time no one could anticipate how short-lived this journal initiative would prove to be and the future of its organizers.

The 10th Party Congress was held in Moscow in March 1921, at which requisitioning was replaced with tax in kind and the NEP was proclaimed. Economic levers of management became dominant and new opportunities for the social activities of the people were provided. One of the direct consequences of the NEP was the "Smena Vekh" trend. This was a left-bourgeois trend the name of which came from the collection "Smena Vekh," which was published in Prague in the summer of 1921. Although hostile to the ideas of communism, unlike other movements which functioned abroad, this one took the path of cooperation with the Soviet system and of supporting it as the only force which could lead the country out of its state of chaos and dislocation while, at the same time, nurturing the hope that the soviets would break down.

In the eyes of the White emigres, this trend was "red" and met with violent opposition. A. Tolstoy supported the trend, as a Russian patriot who wanted to do something good for the homeland. We are familiar with the truly unprecedented persecution to which he was subjected in the White emigre newspapers, journals and almanacs for his "treason." This persecution began immediately after Chaykovskiy had turned to A. Tolstoy with the following question: "How are we to interpret

your cooperation with NAKANUNE, which is clearly supported with Bolshevik money and which openly set itself the task of fighting the Russian emigres?..."

Of late, interest in the fate of Russian literary emigres has become exceptionally great. Let us say openly that in such cases there is a shade of sensationalism and that the members of the emigre movement are almost awarded the halo of martyrdom. The one-sidedness and, sometimes, open hostility displayed in the speeches of some emigres on the subject of what was happening in the homeland, is forgotten. This makes the patriotic step taken by A. Tolstoy even more important. It would befit a few people to reread this letter today in its full text. But let us quote some excerpts from it. From the "Open Letter to N.V. Chaykovskiy," dated 14 April 1922: "... The newspaper NAKANUNE considers the current Bolshevik government the real, the only real power which alone can today protect the Russian borders from encroachments by neighbors and maintain the unity of the Russian state..."

"I am the ordinary type of the Russian exile, i.e., a person who has gone through the entire sad route of purgatory....

"The Reds won, the internecine war ended but we, Russian emigres in Paris, continued to live with the inertia of the old struggle. We survived on wild rumors and fantastic hopes. With every passing day we set a new deadline for the bolsheviks to fall... We ate the bitter bread of foreign countries.

"... The concept of Russia as being some kind of barren and dead plain, covered with graves, with nests of bolshevik bandits, is a fantastic concept which is being replaced by a concept closer to reality. Not all of Russia died and collapsed; there are 150 million people living in its plains although, naturally, poorly, hungry and lice-ridden. Despite the difficult life and hunger, however, they wish neither an invasion by foreigners or to surrender Smolensk nor their own death and doom. The Russian population is totally unwilling to take into consideration whether its line of behavior at home, in Russia, is considered suitable or unsuitable to political groups living outside Russia.

"... My conscience dictates to me not to crawl into a basement but to go to Russia and hammer in my little nail, to help the Russia boat battered by the storms."

It was thus that the former count answered the former revolutionary.

A. Tolstoy's letter had the impact of an exploding bomb. Soon afterwards it was reprinted in full in Soviet Russia, in IZVESTIYA.

Not the least important role in this campaign of persecution and slander which the White emigre press immediately, as though on order, launched against A. Tolstoy was played by P.N. Milyukov (1859-1943), a name much better known than that of Chaykovskiy.

The son of a professor of architecture, in 1882 Milyukov graduated from Moscow University and became a professional historian. Some of his works, such as "*Ocherki po Istorii Russkoy Kultury*" [Essays on the History of Russian Culture], based on rich factual data, had numerous editions. Actually, P. Milyukov was always much more interested in political activities. In 1907 he became chairman of the Central Committee of the Constitutional-Democratic Party (Cadets) and the editor of its newspaper RECH. Habits developed from his pedagogical-lecturing activities came in handy: deputies attending the 3rd and 4th State Dumas were frequently able to appreciate the oratorical talent of their colleague.

There is no need to discuss in detail Milyukov's political views, for they have been quite adequately described in historical and referential publications (although let me note, incidentally, that in all likelihood our historiography would benefit from the publication of specific monographs which would describe as a whole the activities of the most outstanding bourgeois politicians of the period of the three Russian revolutions). Milyukov's anti-people's and anti-democratic orientation as minister of foreign affairs in the Provisional Government were obvious: the slogan of war to a victorious end, which was hated by the masses, the effort to preserve the monarchy, an idea which incidentally, was immediately compromised, active actions against the bolsheviks, and others.

Quite naturally Milyukov went into foreign exile, where his tactics became more flexible. The concept of armed struggle against the soviets (preached by people such as Chaykovskiy) had proven its lack of foundation. From a compromise with the extreme right, Milyukov suggested a conversion to an alliance with the "socialists"—the mensheviks and the SR—which was considered by the extremists an inadmissible political compromise. In the spring of 1922, when the former minister of the Provisional Government came to lecture in Berlin, an event took place indicating the exacerbation of internal contradictions within the emigre camp. Milyukov's speech in the concert hall was unexpectedly interrupted by the loud shout: "For tsar and Russia!" It was with these words that a stranger hurled himself on the stage and fired a pistol several times. Milyukov miraculously survived. However, another member of the Cadet Party—V.D. Nabokov (the father of the subsequently famous writer) was killed and several people were wounded. The terrorists turned out to be R. Shabelskiy-Bork and S. Taboritskiy, extremist White Guards, obscurantists who were directly connected to the Supreme Monarchy Council.

It is assumed that one of the purposes of Milyukov's trip to Berlin was an effort to influence the supporters of "*Smena Vekh*." On 7 April 1922 Milyukov published in

the Paris newspaper POSLEDNIYE NOVOSTI, which he edited, the article "Unwanted Allies." In that article he distinguished among three "positions" in Russian political life: 1. bolshevik; 2. democratic (the leader of which he considered himself) and 3. restoration-monarchic. According to Milyukov, there was also the "semi-opposition" newspaper RUL, holding a position between the democrats and the monarchists (published in Berlin). Now, however, yet another totally undesirable "semi-opposition" had developed, between the bolsheviks and the democrats, i.e., the groups around the newspaper NAKANUNE. To give Milyukov his due, his instincts did not betray him. It is indeed true that the NAKANUNE groups were quite united in supporting Moscow and subsequently ever more actively cooperated with the bolsheviks.

Let us recall that A. Tolstoy published his "Open Letter to N.V. Chaykovskiy" on 14 April. One week later, on 22 April, the first installment of a huge article by Milyukov entitled "The Case of Count Tolstoy" appeared in POSLEDNIYE NOVOSTI. In this article Milyukov was doing everything possible to neutralize the impact of the "Letter" on the emigres, and to lower the tremendous impression it had made on those who were vacillating.

The paths of A. Tolstoy and of the emigres decisively parted. Subsequently he became an outstanding Soviet writer, a classic of our literature. Among the emigres, as time passed, the process of breakdown became increasingly active, as thoroughly analyzed in the monograph by L. Shkarenkov "The Agony of the White Emigres."

The day the fascists attacked the Soviet Union the various emigre groups reacted differently. Some took the path of open cooperation with the Hitlerites, hoping that the old order would be restored in our country (we shall discuss them too). Others realized that under the bolsheviks their homeland had become truly a great and powerful state and increasingly began to sympathize with it, particularly after the victory at Stalingrad. In 1943 that same Milyukov published an article in which he was forced to acknowledge that the policy of the bolsheviks during the 5-year periods had yielded results and was the foundation for victory on the front of the struggle against fascism. "There are times when a choice becomes mandatory," he wrote. A. Tolstoy had realized this two decades earlier and not only realized it but made a choice, despite the tremendous pressure which all kinds of Chaykovists, Milyukovists, Vessenovists and the like had put on him.

The novel "Purgatory" came out in 1920 in the Paris journal GRYADUSHCHAYA ROSSIYA and, subsequently, in Paris' SOVREMENNYE ZAPISKI. A. Tolstoy became perhaps the first Russian writer who distinguished himself in such a difficult and responsible genre—a novel on contemporary events.

Need we mention how difficult it is to understand all of this in the immediate aftermath of events? A. Tolstoy's story was consistent and purposeful in criticizing the life of the upper classes in pre-October Russia and in the search for true moral values. However, at that time the writer could not accurately interpret the views of the revolutionaries on the reorganization of life in Russia and he exaggerated their character features.

A major role was played in this case by the writer's pain caused by the loss of homeland which he, a Russian, felt to the marrow of his bones. Still fresh in his memory were scenes of his panicky escape with his family on the crowded boat "Kavkaz" sailing out of Odessa. The whole world seemed to be collapsing. Russia has been abandoned to defamation by some kind of sinister forces. Naturally, deprived as he was of accurate information, the counterrevolutionary feelings of White Guard circles had an extremely strong influence on A. Tolstoy.

The critics reacted quite actively to the publication of the novel which was noted both by emigre and foreign newspapers in many countries. Naturally, it was noted in Soviet Russia as well. The first expanded response to "Purgatory" was written by Aleksandr Konstantinovich Voronskiy (1884-1943), editor of the journal KRASNAYA NOV, the first big literary-artistic journal published in the Soviet republic. In an article "On Two Novels," A. Voronskiy sharply criticized Tolstoy's book as a typical manifestation of an emigre literature which had already developed abroad.

What are the two novels about which A. Voronskiy wrote? The second, "From the Two-Headed Eagle to the Red Flag," was by P. Krasnov and was a huge work, the scale and ideas of which were inversely proportional to its volume: The Russian revolution was nothing other than the product of the intrigues of international Zionism. P. Krasnov (1869-1947) was a special kind of author. He had become a novelist "in his leisure time," as we say today. As a lieutenant general in the Russian Army, his "job" was war. First war in general, as part of his duties, and then war against the people. It was to him that in the October days of 1917 A. Kerenskiy had issued the order to move troops on Petrograd and to suppress the revolution. His forces were defeated and he personally was captured. Initially, the bolsheviks, the "bloody" customs of which were the topics of thousands of legends created by the White Guards, were kind to their enemies which, if truth be known, was amazing at that time. The general was released on his word of honor not to fight the bolsheviks anymore. The general willingly gave his word and immediately rushed to the Don where he became the ataman of the Don Cossacks. He raised an army, abolished the soviets and mounted an armed struggle against the bolsheviks. He was once again defeated, escaped abroad and became one of the most consistent and malicious enemies of the land of the soviets. Unlike

many others, such as Milyukov, Krasnov not only failed to see the light but, conversely, he cooperated with the fascists. He was captured and sentenced to death by a Soviet court.

But all of this was to take place later. Immediately after the revolution, the general began to fight it pen in hand.

It was by the will of the critic that A. Tolstoy found himself in the company of this kind of author. Naturally, A. Voronskiy could not fail to realize the fact that the talent of the authors and the differences in the overall tonality of their works were not comparable. In that same article, however, he quite precisely indicated his own methodological view: everything followed two main separate directions: bolshevism and anti-bolshevism. In a period of aggravated class struggle there was no place for shades and nuances.... It was precisely the circumstances that dictated at that time, above all, the logic of actions and assessments.

A. Voronskiy, who had been a member of the clergy, had joined the RSDWP(b) in 1904. He was familiar with jails and exiles, which were the usual lot of a professional revolutionary.... After the victory of the October Revolution he had edited *RABOCHIY KRAY*, the newspaper of the Ivanovo-Voznesensk proletariat. A brilliant organizer of literary forces, he did exceptionally much for the development of the young Soviet literature and the laying of its aesthetic foundations. Unfortunately, for a long time A. Voronskiy's literary legacy was ignored by the researchers. The all-union scientific conference, which was planned in connection with the centennial of the critic's birth, did not take place. However, we cannot recreate a historically accurate picture of the development of Soviet literature, at least that of the 1920s, without a profound study of everything A. Voronskiy accomplished.

Voronskiy's distinguishing feature was his amazing responsiveness to the dynamics of events. In April 1922, the moment A. Tolstoy broke up with the emigres, the critic immediately undertook to correspond with him. As early as the end of that year, *KRASNAYA NOV*, published in Soviet Russia, came out with "Aelita," a work by a writer living abroad but who praised the revolutionary energy of the people (the character of Red Army man Gusev became one of the prototypes of the positive character in Soviet literature. It was highly rated by D. Furmanov and had a clear influence on him in his work on Chapayev's character).

But then why did everything change so quickly: in 1921 A. Voronskiy sharply criticized A. Tolstoy; in 1922 he published his novel in a Soviet journal. The times were to be "blamed." Social processes had accelerated. Events were incredibly compressed. It is true that the revolution is the locomotive engine of history. But, nonetheless,

who was right: A. Tolstoy in describing the revolution (in which case A. Voronskiy was wrong) or A. Voronskiy (at which point A. Tolstoy appears like a writer who hastily changed his "landmarks")?

The point is that in such cases simple answers, as convenient as they are simple, will not do. What is needed is a close and comprehensive study of every phenomenon in its socially governed dynamics and dialectical mobility. One-sidedness and a pamphleteering description of characters of revolutionaries are obvious in the first draft of "*Purgatory*." In a subsequent revision of his novel, A. Tolstoy deleted many pages, and refined some of his interpretations. Nonetheless, we cannot say that in the earlier draft as well the novel was a revolutionary pamphlet. Above all, it was aimed against extremes and distortions which frequently assumed priority at that time. True revolutionaries, having forgotten the meaning of sleep and recreation, sacrificing everything, had made the revolution. Pseudo-revolutionaries practiced outbursts and chose the simplest ways of asserting the new, so that nothing of the old would be left! Not even a drop!

According to A. Tolstoy, who had been raised in the old humanitarian-democratic tradition, the most terrible thing was that the revolutionaries preached so-called "equality based on a minimum." If mediocrity cannot be raised to the level of a talent, it is always possible to reduce talent to the level of mediocrity! Actually, at that point the very concept of individuality was frequently voided of meaning, as practiced by the most extreme members of the proletkult, who preached the worst forms of barracks socialism. It was they who loudly proclaimed as their ideal a society which would consist exclusively of faceless beings, deprived of names and identified by numbers only.

Lenin was the most consistent opponent of the proletkult. He waged an irreconcilable struggle against distortions in the field of spiritual building. Let us recall the famous party document on problems of culture, the letter of the RKP(b) Central Committee "On the Proletkult," which was published on 1 December 1920.

In a period of fierce class struggle, the bolshevik A. Voronskiy saw an effort to distort the essence of the revolution in any critical remark about it. However, he realized quite quickly that A. Tolstoy's motivations were different and undertook to support them, something which yielded brilliant results. It was not a case of "Aelita" alone. A. Tolstoy was the editor of the literary supplement to the newspaper *NAKANUNE*. The moment A. Voronskiy began to correspond with him, he turned to the critic with the following request: to send to him short works by Soviet writers to be published in the supplement. It was thus that a "bloc," unprecedented for that time, was established between Moscow and Berlin: between a communist and a former count who had recently broken with the emigres. The supplement began to carry works by M. Gorkiy, K. Fedin, Vs. Ivanov, S.

Yesenin, B. Pilnyak, K. Chukovskiy, M. Slonimskiy, N. Aseyev and others. Actually, some outstanding Soviet writers started their careers precisely in NAKANUNE and its supplement, people such as M. Bulgakov, who frequently sent to it his essays on life in Moscow and commentaries.

During that same spring of 1922, first steps to rally writers within a single professional society were being taken in the capital of the young Soviet republic. To this effect a special commission which included noted political and cultural personalities, including A. Voronskiy, started work under the Agitprop of the RKP(b) Central Committee. The commission was headed by Ya. Yakovlev, deputy head of Agitprop (we know how greatly he was helped personally by Lenin in the struggle against the errors of the proletkult with its caste and isolationist orientation). Thus, while A. Tolstoy continued to live abroad, he was included in the membership of the society. Furthermore, he became member of its organizational bureau, together with writers such as V. Bryusov, Vs. Ivanov, N. Aseyev, A. Voronskiy, N. Lyashko and others (there were 13 members).

Life persists in being richer than our frequently firmly established ideas about it! To this day we read in works of literary experts that the Soviet writer A. Tolstoy became a writer only after he had returned to the homeland and underwent a certain "evolution" which was quite long, lasting at least a few years. A. Tolstoy, a Soviet writer who has done a great deal for the young revolutionary literature, had become a writer while still in Berlin.

Back in the homeland, he met Voronskiy in person. As described by Voronskiy's daughter, Galina Aleksandrovna Voronskaya, A. Tolstoy met her father repeatedly, not only in official editorial surroundings but also at home, and their talks were invariably conducted in a lively and friendly interested tone.

It is regrettable that neither left his memoirs. Voronskiy's life ended tragically: at first he became the victim of fierce attacks by simpletons belonging to the RAPP. He was expelled from the party then reinstated but, in the final account, repressed and eventually rehabilitated posthumously. A. Tolstoy, had a personality which did not lend itself to memoirs, absorbed as he was by life in its entire variety and attractiveness. Actually, who at that time would start mentioning the fact that he had been an emigre....

One of the first, as was the case with A. Voronskiy, to respond to the publication of A. Tolstoy's novel was V. Polonskiy (1886-1932). He published in his journal PECHAT I REVOLYUTSIYA a sharply critical article on Aleksey Tolstoy's "*Purgatory*." Let us note that this occurred in 1923, i.e., after the writer had broken with the emigres. Probably few people, even among the specialists, would recall that this was not the first "encounter" between the critic and the writer.

Their first meeting had taken place much earlier: Tolstoy was 27 when he published a two-volume work of prose which brought him overwhelming fame. Polonskiy was 25. On three separate occasions he had written in 1911 articles on A. Tolstoy's stories, the novel "*Two Lives*" and a collection of poems "*Beyond the Blue Rivers*." Subsequently, they went their own separate ways. One became a noted writer while the other became involved in politics (supporting the mensheviks) without, however, abandoning literary criticism and continuing, from time to time, to publish in various journals and newspapers articles on L. Andreyev, B. Zaytsev, A. Remizov, S. Gorodetskiy and others.

Soon after the October revolution, V. Polonskiy left the Menshevik Party and joined the ranks of the RKP(b). During the civil war he headed the literary-publishing department of the Red Army political directorate, which gave him extensive material for the subsequent publication of a thorough monograph on the "*Russian Revolutionary Poster*." He wrote about Bakunin and Dostoyevskiy and many contemporary literary workers; between 1926 and 1931 he was the editor of the journal NOVYY MIR.

Like Voronskiy, V. Polonskiy closely followed the emigre press. For example he was the author of the accurate and satirically devastating description of the most reactionary newspaper RUL, which was being published in Berlin and whose editor was the extreme obscurantist I.V. Gessen. After A. Tolstoy had broken with the emigres, RUL organized a real crusade against him and mounted a campaign of persecution and slander of unprecedented harshness. It was hardly likely that V. Polonskiy would be unaware of such persecution. In any case, he was informed of the major changes which had taken place in Tolstoy's conceptual views.

The article we mentioned acknowledged that Tolstoy's book had not appeared by accident and that it was based on "civic sadness" and directly related "to the trials experienced by the author's homeland. It was something created by the revolution and spoke about the revolution." However, the main thrust of the article was different: in 1918-1920 the writer was "a person on the other side," and it was no accident that his book was ranked along with P. Krasnov's slanderous novel. As to the moral searches of the main characters, according to the critic, a thick stench of baseness came out of the idyllic pictures of the love between Dasha and Telegin. It was claimed that the breath of conceptual perceptions and psychological analysis was inaccessible to Tolstoy. This makes the subsequent actions taken by V. Polonskiy quite strange: A. Tolstoy returned to the homeland and actively joined in building a socialist culture while the critic on another two occasions and without any revision reprinted the same article in 1924 and 1928, claiming that the emigre writer was hostile to the revolution.

As early as 1926 reviewers were amazed by the fact that V. Polonskiy had ignored all the substantial changes which the writer had made to the novel prior to its new

1925 edition. For that reason the stipulation in the postface to the article, according to which Aleksey Tolstoy had "turned into a Soviet writer" from being an emigre writer sounded, to say the least, not very convincing. V. Polonskiy should have known better than others the organic nature, the depth and the irreversibility of the changes which had taken place in Tolstoy's outlook, for it was precisely in the journal NOVYY MIR, which he edited, that the writer had published the second part of his trilogy "*The Year 1918*," in which extensive descriptions of the civil war were given.

As an editor, V. Polonskiy was even more equivocal in his feelings toward the author of "*The Year 1918*." The point is that in the eyes of the vulgarizing RAPP-Lefov type criticism, A. Tolstoy remained a hated character. Some had stated bluntly that he had returned to Russia for the sake of corrupting Soviet literature. The editor of the RAPP journal NA POSTU claimed quite unequivocally that "vestiges of bourgeois palace literature, which are continuing to live out their days abroad, are increasingly infiltrating the USSR, rallying themselves with some eternal emigres. This literature, in all its shades, ranging from obviously counterrevolutionary (Gippius, Bunin, Merezhkovskiy and others) to repentant members of the nobility (Al. Tolstoy) and repentant and nonrepentant mystics (Andrey Belyy) is hostile to the working class and cannot fail to meet the sharpest possible rebuff on the part of the party." Yet it was a book written by this kind of writer that the journal used to note the 10th anniversary of the October Revolution.... V. Polonskiy decided to "insure" himself and added to his conclusion a number of quite different remarks.

In 1922 A. Tolstoy had to prove that he had accepted the revolution. Now he had to fight for presenting it in art in a fruitful and honest manner. Tolstoy's letter to V. Polonskiy, dated 4 May 1927, was an outstanding phenomenon of a writer's publicism. Following are some excerpts from it:

"... Had I not known who you were, I may have thought that what you want of me is a poster-novel, an official booster-novel. However, it is precisely that which you do not want.

"We must reach a most serious agreement concerning my novel. The first is that I not only accept the revolution, for a mere acceptance would be inadequate in terms of writing a novel. I love its dark greatness and its universal scope. Therefore, the task of my novel is to present this greatness, this scope in its entire complexity and difficulties. Second: we know that the revolution won. However, you write that from my very first words I should start beating the kettle drums of victory. You want me to begin with the victory and only then, obviously, describe its crushed enemies. I refuse to write a novel based on such a structure. For this would be one

of the many posters which would not convince anyone any longer, young people in particular. You want me to begin a novel starting with the end.

"My plan for the novel and its entire emotionalism consist of the gradual development of the revolution and its incredible difficulties and the fact that a handful of Peter proletariat, guided by Lenin's "explosion of ideas" plunged itself into the bloody mess of Russia, won and organized the country. In my novel I take living people with all their weaknesses and their entire strengths, and it is precisely these living people who accomplish this living deed.

"... In the final account, I must bear all responsibility. I do not fear it, for it is with complete selflessness that I love, and it is a pity that there is no more powerful word than that, the Russian revolution... Allow me to speak in my own novel without fearing anyone, without looking behind me..."

The purpose of these notes was not to draw theoretical summations. My modest task was to prove, with specific facts, the extent to which the picture of the development of artistic consciousness can be enriched the moment we break the circle of customary comparisons and try to remember that, in the final account, the historian of literature is, in the strict meaning of the term, a historian.

The tremendous restructuring which has developed in the country is not being particularly felt as yet in our scientific and teaching circles (the fact that no substantive works have as yet appeared is understandable but, for example, the curricula on the basis of which Soviet literature and 20th century literature are being taught in VUZs to tens of thousands of students have not been changed at all). No future work is possible without improving the existing methodological principles and, above all, without strengthening historicism as a prerequisite for new scientific summations which would enable us to establish more profoundly the laws which have governed the development of Soviet literature.

The comprehensive consideration of phenomena, of their internal features and the entire variety of ties with the rest of the world, is the most important prerequisite for a truly scientific approach. Lenin wrote in his "*Philosophical Notebooks*" that "the totality of all aspects of a phenomenon and of reality in their (reciprocal) connection is what constitutes the truth" ("*Poln. Sobr. Soch.*" [Complete Collected Works], vol 29, p 178). In the study of the complex problems and periods "in the first chapter and more than anywhere else, we must depict the process as a whole, and take into consideration all the trends and define their resultant force or else their sum total, their result" (op. cit., vol 27, pp 195-196).

It is particularly important to study the role of specific social factors in the creative behavior of the artist during crucial times of history, such as the Great October Socialist Revolution.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**The Fascination of an Illusion; Monologue of an Actress**

18020006n Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 110-114

[Article by Olga Mikhaylovna Ostroumova, honored actress of the RSFSR]

[Text] I do not like the word "prestige." I know that I do not invest it with its dictionary interpretation but I do not like to hear it. In the final account, dictionaries are behind the interpretation of concepts. Am I imagining all of this? I do not know.

On one occasion I was invited to attend a graduation ceremony in the school attended by my children. I heard that unfortunate word and, naturally, I reacted correspondingly. I spoke out. The children who were sitting in the hall behaved too much like adults. I called upon them to remain young, not to lose their youthful passion, the feeling of newness of life. To seek not the prestige of a future profession but to look at the needs of their country and people. Prestige stems not from the best part of practical experience. Why, I asked, do you need such experience? Be better than we are, more intelligent and morally stronger. We frequently remain passive in the face of injustice, or obvious and concealed bureaucracy. We thought one thing and said something else. That is how the stupid concept of prestige appeared. A prestige object, a prestige position, prestigious acquaintanceships.... It is prestigious to have a car and a dacha, and to be a diplomat and not to be a carpenter or an engineer. Why?

Naturally, it is not a question of words. What angers me is not the word but what it represents in our lives. In my view, prestige means an assessment, a moral assessment of someone or something. However, this is an assessment based on purely external features, from the ordinary and, sometimes, philistine viewpoint. In principle, as I understand it, under socialism any work should be prestigious to the extent to which it is needed by society. However, such is not the case!

After my improvised speech at the school, I started looking at dictionaries and was amazed to discover that prestige was considered synonymous with authority. Without trying to draw theoretical conclusions, this is something I disagree with. Yes, authority is also a moral judgment. But what kind of judgment! In any case, it does not apply to the surface of things. Authoritativeness

is something good! It must be earned. Prestige, however, seems to be acquired in connection with a position, a place, a fashionable object. Do you understand? An authoritative person I consider important. I respect his principles, his thoughts and actions and I listen to his advice, not because of my job but because I feel an inner need to do so, comparing something within me with such a person. I feel ashamed whenever I do something bad when I think of this person even if he is not there, even if he will never find out. As to prestige...

Dictionaries. According to the dictionaries, this word has two origins: French and Latin. In the former, at one point it meant charm. In the second which is, in all likelihood older, something which pleased me tremendously when I read it, it meant an illusion, a deception. What kind? Combining the two meanings, the result is that it is either the illusion of charm, or the charm of an illusion. Does this sound contemporary enough?

Let us assume that prestige is the way society rates a person. Under capitalism, where objects rather than people are valued, wealth becomes an attribute of prestige such as, for example, a luxurious automobile or a private cottage. In this case everything is perfectly clear and nothing to be amazed at. But why is it that in our country, under socialism, that the same prevails? Is it not because the superficial assessment of human significance has become dominant? Why is it that material values have suppressed many spiritual values in our ordinary ideas? Is this an accident? Or else should we blame vestiges of capitalism?

Here is what I think: the reason is that in our society until recently what was inordinate and original was not encouraged. The result was that a prestigious position or a fashionable object, everything is acceptable other than one main thing: authority. Creative toil, high professionalism and an honest attitude toward the work, if not clearly seen as would they be in an actor, or an engineer, if lacking an external effect, were devalued and belittled. But in terms of society what difference does it make whether creativity is visible or not? It should be equally valued. The result was what was of no special value judging by the salary of an actor and that of an engineer. The surgeon Ilizarov, who is famous today, had to break tremendous bureaucratic obstacles to perform his medical miracle. Meanwhile, movie director German failed to do so. It was only 15 years later that we were able to see "Road Check." Such things are more difficult in the arts.

It was better for Ilizarov, however. Is he an authoritative person? He certainly is. The people rush to him. How many people are those to whom he has restored the health and, happiness, if you wish. They built a clinic for him. That was outstanding! Yet he has still not been made a member of the Medical Academy. How to interpret this without deviating from the topic of our conversation? Others were unwilling officially to accept



this truly existing reputation of a universally famous scientist. In a word, there was authoritativeness without prestige. Such was the situation!

This is something worth thinking about. Why is there such a disparity? Authoritativeness and prestige are interrelated concepts. Essentially, prestige must represent the social acknowledgment of authoritativeness. Nothing else. Do you agree? Yet in our country, during the period of stagnation, these concepts became separated from each other. Prestige became an assessment of anything one could wish other than of authoritativeness. You know, this seems to me quite natural. By its very nature prestige is a conservative matter, like any custom or stereotype. Authoritativeness (i.e., the human qualities of competence, general erudition, inner culture, wisdom and simplicity, boldness of thought and liveliness of feelings) is dynamic and does not tolerate stagnation as its companion. Furthermore, it is also modest. Prestige is loud, self-advertising, impudently aggressive. The result is that authoritativeness, demanded by no one, retreated while prestige began to blossom.

I believe that the attack which prestige mounted on authoritativeness is one of the manifestations of our major difficulties in the public consciousness. This was an attack on action, creativity and the individual. It meant a confusion of assessments: a plant or a theater could lose their authoritativeness but durable prestige will maintain the appearance of success. It is prestigious to attend a performance at the Bolshoy and even simply to say that one could go there anytime. According to the specialists, the authoritativeness of our operatic standard bearer has declined. Is this not because of prestige? Noted artists must now sing not for those who truly value their mastery but for foreign tourists and people with "business" contacts.

I had the opportunity to play the role of a militant seeker of prestige. In the movie *"The Time of Our Sons,"* I played the role of the wife of the son of an academician. I organized a concentrated attack to promote my husband. Go, Go! Go, advance! Shove the others out of your way as long as papa lives. I want to fall into the academic heaven! Can you imagine such a personality? This type of little lady would walk on corpses to reach her objective. How many such people were able to penetrate the academic heaven and other lofty spheres! Looking at our own personalities one becomes terribly afraid. This makes very, very clear why restructuring is developing with such difficulty. Prestige, which has become the meaning of life, is what prevents us from distinguishing between true and false values and makes us strive for petty but "sated" success.

Today everything has become more complex. A silent but fierce struggle is taking place. I try to understand its psychology, again from a professional viewpoint. I played in a new film directed by Viktor Tregubovich. I could describe my role as one of "restructuring."... It is normal for my character to speak the way I would. Our

vocabulary is the same. No particularly base behavior. All of a sudden, something happens. This is an awful, an awful woman. She betrays her own daughter and nastily so, in order to compromise her. Why? In the final account, for reasons of prestige. The daughter has fallen in love with a handicapped youngster. The mother, however, was preparing a much more advantageous marriage for her child. On the surface, everything seems normal. I was not a criminal. Do you understand? Nothing in me reveals dark thoughts, treachery and betrayal. I am full of the illusion of charm. That is what is terrible, prestige, in the pejorative meaning of the term, is today subject to radical restructuring, not without success.

In human life prestige is usually cynical and, as a rule, considers nothing sacred. Real art cannot do without sincerity. However, it also happens that good people, charming and honest people, have created either false or semi-truthful works of art. However, in the worst meaning of the term, these were prestigious works. An artist is an emotional and impressionable person and his profession demands the ability to live with the thoughts and feelings of others. This is his profession! That is what some artists told themselves to believe in the justice and accuracy of that which deep within themselves they did not accept. Subsequently they became so much a part of their role that sincerely believed in injustice. Adaptation became part of their character.

I started this conversation in order to be able to ask a few questions I consider sensitive. Here is the first: how many people are there today in our country, high and low managers, ranging from chief of shop to a minister, who have accepted as their own the ideas of restructuring? To one extent or another, everyone has some capacity for autosuggestion. Everyone in his heart is a little bit of an actor. I also think that many people consider restructuring as the need for a change in their customary and previous way of life. At this point I come to the reason for this entire discussion.

Ten years ago I was made member of a small delegation (there were three of us) attending an international film festival. Although we were not all that welcome, we nonetheless showed up. There were crowds waiting to see American movies and buying tickets. Some 10 people were gathered to see the Soviet premiere. This was a strictly Soviet and even strictly Russian movie. And even if a big public had gathered, it would not have impressed anyone.

It was the American film *"Coma"* that was successful. Our film was, generally speaking, about the prestige of the country whereas with their movie the Americans were exposing themselves. The plot was, briefly, as follows: a medical mafia in a clinic would make people comatose or, roughly speaking, put them in a pre-lethal condition. When no hope whatsoever for survival remained, the patients were moved to another clinic where their organs were used for transplants. The mafia

made money from this deliberately created trouble. All of a sudden, a young lady physician realized all of this, saw that such a thing was possible and started a desperate struggle. I liked the movie a great deal. Thoughts which, at that time, were quite unfashionable, came to my head. They were exposing their faults! They did not fear that their prestige would be undermined! And despite my best wishes, all of this triggered respect.

Yes, yes! They bribed me with this film, they made me swallow the bait. But skillfully! They publicly defamed their prestige, i.e., the abstract and superficial idea about the United States. Actually, they lost nothing by doing this. To begin with, this was because in the country where the festival was being held the attitude toward the United States had always been that that country was exploitative and plundering. In terms of prestige no one could do worse. Second, having structured the process of the lady physician on the basis of universal feelings understood by everyone, they logically identified them with civic feelings. I saw a citizen, whom I respected. Such a specific respect in art is immeasurably more valuable than any abstract rejection of something. Politically, the film was a case of major swindle, a propaganda trap. The fact that Martin Luther King had lived and struggled not on the screen, not fictitiously, in the United States, had not made America an embodiment of justice. However, I respect a nation which can promote such people. I respect it. Why is it, therefore, that in other countries we are frequently not respected, although such people in our country are not isolated and our very system is humanistic by its nature? It is socially, economically and politically hostile to any inhumanity. Why is it that the people cannot realize such a simple truth? I shall answer to the extent that I understand it. But let me begin with yet another case.

A reception in a nightclub had been organized for the participants of that same movie festival. We decided to attend. We were not born yesterday. Shall we go in the chartered bus? Shall we take a car? Let us seek our own people! Does that sound familiar? So, the car of the Soviet mission, as it happens, did not come to pick us up at the proper time. No one knew how to get to the club. In short, we arrived 40 minutes later. And so, we showed up. As required, I was wearing an evening dress. The three of us looked around. The festival director coldly but courteously explained that the seats had already been taken and one should not have been late. The head of our delegation was angry: "How do you dare speak to us this way, with the delegation of a great power!" That was the only thing he managed to say. The festival director happily sent us and our great power packing. Naturally, we left. It was our own fault. You see, prestige had made us dizzy.

Our games of prestige became particularly popular during the period of stagnation and did not apply to the morality area alone, for morality does not exist by itself,

is this not so? Everything in life is connected to everything else. In my view, in the recent past a great part in our economic and social problems was immoral.

Thinking like ordinary human beings about governmental and social affairs, all of our recent troubles could be traced to the stupid reverence of prestige and an abusive attitude toward authoritativeness. We were more concerned with prestige, with what would others think of us, than with the country's reputation. We were concerned with making a good impression on others and not on ourselves. Meanwhile, the reputation of the country was declining. Intoxicated with our former accomplishments, we did not notice the appearance of stagnation in areas where socialism has always led. True values, not ostentatious ones, became obsolete like the rural clubs and rayon polyclinics of which we were proud half a century ago. Prestige, which was the reflection of this pride, became an abstract frozen stereotype. But how could it be! Everything in our country was splendid. How frequently we claimed that we had free medicine and free education. Now, we are speaking of a lag in health care and of the results achieved by our general education schools.

I recently read in the newspaper that in Turkmenia infant mortality was being concealed. Why? For the sake of prestige! The prestige of socialism... This is shameful. I am convinced that in its moral sense restructuring means above all upgrading the reputation of honest labor, true creativity and upgrading the reputation of the country and of socialism, of all of its truly human qualities and specific contributions to the progress of mankind. Then prestige would come by itself, for it has nowhere else to go.

Our country does enjoy authority, a great deal of it! The point is that not everyone can feel and experience this, directly linking this feeling to his own personal destiny. External feelings of prestige are quite accessible for which reason they have been probably greatly distorted. I do not even know whether the expression "a feeling of authoritativeness" is good Russian. I have never heard it said but...

No, it would be better for me to describe one more picture. Once again the movie festival. It was in Venice. There were crowds and diamonds were dazzling the eyes. We brought the movie "*Dawns Are Peaceful Here...*" Frankly, this was not a particularly entertaining movie.

We, the makers, were introduced to the public: Stanislav Rostotskiy, Irina Shevchuk and I. The lights were turned off and the projection began. You may remember, this movie develops slowly. There is in each one of us something familiar with this slowness which, in my personal case, is related to my childhood. The public in Venice, found this boring. There were jokes, and some people began to leave. There was absolutely no identification with the picture. Suddenly... there was a passage in which Sonya started shouting and calling Vaskov and

Zhenya. The enemy was there, face to face. The fight began. Zhenya hit the fascist with the butt of the rifle. Suddenly, there was applause in the hall. Happiness!... With our own blood, with our own truth... not I, naturally. At that time I was not even born. A war was being waged and there was death. It was life. It was something human. Do you understand? Rostotskiy had made this movie not only to glorify the fatherland but also the memory of a nurse who had pulled him out of death and into life. He had invested so much warmth, so many other things in that film... How can I put it? It was the truth! He was telling us, the young actresses: "Girls! Do not think that war is merely tears and blood. At that time we were very young and we knew how to enjoy life. This is human nature." Later... at another point there was applause and more and more applause. The 2,000 people in the hall, a foreign audience emotionally attuned to something else, became as one. And when sometime during the night the film ended, we were the recipients of an incredible ovation. We were sitting backstage, facing the audience which was below us. The people rose from their seats and everyone turned to us. I was boundlessly happy, thinking, why me? This was simply an accident. Instead of me there should have been someone who had fought that war, who was a young girl at that time. It was that girl who should have been applauded. I was simply lucky. I felt... how can I say it... I felt embraced.... Behind me, you understand, was my entire country, my country at war and today, my entire country. It was my aunt Mota and uncle Petya, fashionable girls in miniskirts, the disabled, old women, all those who had experienced the war, all those who had died and all those who are still alive. They were there. I was merely their representative abroad. At that point I felt what homeland means and how high its reputation is.

How greatly thankful I was at that time for my difficult profession, although I knew well that aristocratic Venice was applauding not only our skill, but yes, yes, precisely, those whom we represented. This was a hundred times more valuable.

Naturally, the Soviet people experience the same type of feelings under different situations as well. But let us honestly ask ourselves: are they not all too infrequent? I would very much like to experience once again the same type of upheaval, whether in Venice or anywhere else in the world but after a movie about what today is only beginning to develop in our country. I would like to hear an ovation in a foreign country not in my honor as an actress or in honor of the professional skill of my colleagues. Yes, for all of us. Do you understand? For the Soviet people. I also want someone to be ashamed if he acts poorly, against his conscience, if he works at half his strength, if he feels that he is sinking in the mire of pettiness, if he becomes intoxicated with undeserved honor, and to be ashamed when thinking of the great reputation which has existed on earth for the past 70 years.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### Soviet Diplomatic Bulletin

180200060 Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 115-116

[Review by Yu. Molchanov]

[Text] A new publication has been added to the big family of domestic journals: starting with August 1987, the VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSSR began publications twice monthly (8 issues have already come out). The first issue of this printed periodical of the Soviet diplomatic service came out as early as July 1919. Several years later, however, it was closed down. The present publication marks its rebirth.

The new journal, the task of which is to inform the readers on the activities of Soviet diplomacy, began during a crucial and difficult period, when a struggle of historical proportions on the basic global problem to which the destiny of all peoples is related was initiated: the problem of the survival of human civilization and the preservation of life on earth. Acting together with all the forces of peace, reason and good will, in this struggle the Soviet Union and its foreign policy services are trying to promote political detente through active, daring and firm activities, to prevent a nuclear missile catastrophe, to lay a path to a nuclear-free and nonviolent world and to create a reliable and comprehensive system of international security.

The bulletin of the USSR MID began publications under circumstances in which, as throughout our entire country, a profound restructuring is taking place in the Soviet foreign policy department, with the reorganization of the structure of its central apparatus and changes in the nature and pace of work of leading subunits, embassies and other Soviet establishments abroad, and a renovation of cadres. At the same time, new approaches are being formulated in virtually all areas of foreign political activities. All of this reflects the systematic line followed by the CPSU of upgrading the efficiency of the Soviet diplomatic service.

It is understandable, therefore, that the publication of a specialized printed organ of the USSR MID has triggered a great deal of interest and drawn the attention of the Soviet and foreign public.

The first issue of the journal opened with the speech delivered by M.S. Gorbachev at the USSR MID on 23 May 1986, previously unpublished, in which Soviet diplomats were assigned with the radical task of shifting all their activities to a modern track, drastically upgrading their quality and improving its creative content, style and methods.

The CPSU Central Committee General Secretary pointed out the urgent need for the activities of our diplomacy to be closely linked with the interests of the

Soviet state. It must contribute to the domestic development of the country. Its task is to ensure peace, without which all else becomes meaningless. However, it is also called upon to create as favorable foreign conditions as possible for the acceleration of the socioeconomic development of Soviet society. Nonetheless, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized, we must remember the conclusion drawn at the 27th CPSU Congress: our position in the international arena cannot be preserved without the acceleration of the country's economic and social development. The key to success in foreign policy is the reliability and firmness of rear lines and the health of Soviet society and of our economy.

The topical task of the foreign policy service is to contribute to the implementation of the strategic objectives formulated by the 27th Congress. The Congress answered the question of what is to be done. Now we must more quickly translate its resolutions and stipulations into the language of specific foreign policy actions.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary noted the exceptional importance of making the new thinking dominant in diplomacy as well, so that it may be in step with the time and energetically reject the stereotypes and cliches of the past. The restructuring which is taking place currently throughout our country affects most directly the diplomats as well. Every one of them must display creative stress, and be specific and practical. He must contribute to the type of global development in which our country could help to change the entire system of international relations and more actively participate in the international division of labor.

The speech provides a profound analysis of global developments and the basic trends of the foreign policy activities of the party and the Soviet state. It calls for "updating" the forms and content of diplomatic work, making it face the realities of the contemporary world, imbue the professional activities of the diplomats with the party decisions and subordinate them to the requirements of the April Central Committee Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress. That is why it is so important to direct the work of the diplomatic service toward long-range tasks and to create a background for future action on the basis of scientific studies and evaluations. Greater attention should be paid to the forecasting of events and identifying opportunities for our foreign policy activities and to defining ways of intensifying the dynamism of Soviet foreign policy.

M.S. Gorbachev emphasized that the pursuit of a party cadre policy, which includes the struggle against errors and violations, and the accurate choice and placement of cadres on all levels is of exceptional importance. We must increase the spirit of exigency among all personnel in the diplomatic service. Here there is no place for arrogance and complacency. We need a healthy critical tone. Our diplomats must act skillfully and confidently, for they are backed by the powerful socialist homeland.

The bulletin systematically prints the speeches of E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, at conferences and meetings of the aktiv of the personnel of the USSR MID and its establishments. The content of these speeches offers a clear idea of the deep restructuring which, in accordance with the resolutions of the party congress and the stipulations of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, is taking place in the diplomatic service, with a view to upgrading its efficiency and effectiveness. At the same time, they help us to realize more clearly the responsibility and scale of the problems which face today Soviet foreign policy and, directly, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Each issue of the new journal carries official documents, statements by leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as analytical commentaries on the most important problems of international life and basic trends in Soviet foreign policy. The journal has a permanent section entitled "Smolenskaya-Sennaya Ploshchad, 32/34," which carries information on various Soviet diplomatic activities, international meetings, talks and consultations and new USSR MID appointments.

The materials published in the other permanent section "USSR MID Press-Center," provide a more complete and accurate idea of the nature of current briefings and press conferences given to Soviet and foreign journalists.

Very interesting materials on the history of Soviet diplomacy and various documents, some previously unpublished, are included in the bulletin.

The publication of a special printed organ of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs is a major political event. It is entirely consistent with the Leninist tradition of open and truly people's democracy and is one more manifestation of the atmosphere of glasnost and democracy which is being established in our society on the party's initiative.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

### **China on the Path of Reform**

*18020006p Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) pp 116-119*

[Review by F. Burlatskiy, doctor of philosophical sciences, of a collection of speeches by Deng Xiaoping]

[Text] The Soviet public is showing increasing interest in the development of the PRC and the major structural, economic and political reforms taking place in that country. An important landmark along this way was the recently concluded 13th CPC Congress. The congress

summed up the results of the work done since the 12th Congress (September 1982) and earmarked a program of activities for the forthcoming period.

Noteworthy in this connection is a collection of the speeches and talks given by comrade Deng Xiaoping, entitled "*Basic Problems of Contemporary China*," which came out this year in Beijing. The work includes 47 speeches and talks given by the noted CPC and PRC leader.

The idea expressed by Deng Xiaoping at the 12th CPC Congress on the need "to combine the universal truth of Marxism with the specific reality of our country, to follow our own way and build socialism with a Chinese face..." runs throughout the entire book. The author repeatedly returned to this thought in subsequent years as well. The material included in the collection covers a variety of aspects and problems of building socialism in China: the long-term objectives of the struggle waged by the Chinese people, the economic reform, the reform in the political structure, the building of a socialist spiritual culture, the need to respect the knowledge of specialists, and to struggle against bourgeois liberalization, the expansion of foreign relations, the ways of solving the question of Taiwan, and, as a whole, problems related to the country's foreign policy.

The reforms taking place in China were initiated with the third plenum of the CPC Central Committee, 11th Convocation (December 1978). The plenum passed a resolution on shifting the center of gravity to socialist modernization and to the development of the country's production forces. It was then that supporters of major socioeconomic changes became part of the leadership; the fifth CPC Central Committee Plenum (February 1980) elected the secretariat of the CPC Central Committee, consisting of 11 people, and passed a resolution on the inadmissibility of the cult of personality in the CPC and the restoration of the standards of intraparty and state democracy.

Deng Xiaoping assesses China's historical development as follows: after the founding of the PRC, we completed an agrarian reform and cooperativization in the countryside and a socialist reorganization of capitalist industry and trade in the town. Both were carried out quite well. In 1957, however, leftist views began to appear in our country and gradually assumed the upper hand. The "big leap" in 1958, the comprehensive establishment of people's communes, the one-sided emphasis on their "great scale and social nature," and the conversion to "eating from the common pot" led to major catastrophes. Let us not even mention the "cultural revolution." After the defeat of the "Four" in 1976, we marked time for another two years. Essentially, once again leftist errors continued to be made until 1978.... Based on the summations of the experience, a number of new stipulations were formulated at the 3rd CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation" (pp 115-117).

It was under these circumstances that China's basic objectives for the balance of this century were formulated. In a period of 20 years, from 1958 to 1978, production forces remained virtually unchanged. The per capita gross national product in 1978 averaged about \$250. By the end of the 1970s the task was formulated of raising the gross national product in the next 20 years from \$250 to \$800 per person (a quadruple increase, taking into consideration population increases). In other words, it is a question of achieving an average prosperous living standard in the country. This was followed by defining a longer-range task: in another 20 to 50 years in the 21st century to come closer to the level of the industrially developed countries and to ensure an average income of \$2,000 per person.

Accelerating the pace of economic development on the basis of the implementation of profound reforms is a means of achieving such objectives. According to the initial assumption, the average annual growth of output for the first 10 years from the start of the reform was to be 6.5 percent and the average for the 20-year period, 7.2 percent. Initially such plans were considered incredible by a number of specialists. Nonetheless, for the time being they are being overfulfilled. The gross volume of industrial output, computed in fixed prices, for the past 5 years has been increasing in China by an annual average of 12 percent. This sets real grounds for the tremendous objective of generating a national product worth \$1 trillion by the end of the century.

The economic reform in the countryside was the first step along this way. Its purpose was to change the working and living conditions of 800 million peasants and, at the same time, to create a foundation for the enhancement of industry and other economic sectors. The main content of the reform in the countryside consists of two aspects: conversion to a family contracting system and upgrading state purchase prices of agricultural commodities. The combination of such steps was the only way to achieve the expected results.

By the end of the 1970s and turn of the 1980s, in virtually all villages in the country the land which previously belonged to the people's communes had been evenly distributed among peasant farmsteads. A hundred and eighty million of contracting farmsteads were set up, each one with a small plot of land. In the first years the peasants had to provide the state with a certain percentage of their harvest based on fixed prices. Starting with 1984 they have been concluding contracts with representatives of purchasing organizations. Between 1980 and 1985 purchase prices of agricultural commodities increased by 54 percent as a whole and for grain by nearly 100 percent. As in the past, the peasants sell to the state most of their produce, although the share of goods sold on the free market is increasing steadily.

As a result, the production of grain has been increasing by 4 percent and that of cotton by more than 15 percent annually. The living standard of the peasants has

increased more than it has over the preceding 30 years: from an average of 134 yuan per capita in 1978 to 424 yuan in 1986. A record grain crop was harvested in 1984 of 407.3 million tons. In the subsequent two years grain crops declined somewhat as a result of poor weather conditions and the fact that the peasants became more interested in the production of other agricultural and industrial goods.

The reform not only enhanced agricultural production. Deng Xiaoping notes that "quite unexpectedly for us, it yielded its best result in the development of district and settlement enterprises. All of a sudden, a multisectorial market economy developed and small enterprises of various types appeared as though overnight."

The annual growth of output in district and settlement enterprises has been exceeding 20 percent for the past few years. More than 100 million peasants have become involved in such activities, which made it possible to solve the problem of jobs for 50 percent of the surplus manpower and drastically to reduce migration to the cities. "Neither I," Deng Xiaoping emphasizes, "nor many other comrades expected such results at all."

Although the reform in the countryside had a very quick and noticeable effect, in itself it did not solve all agricultural problems. Retail prices of foodstuffs in the cities were below contractual purchase prices, and the difference was compensated with state subsidies. In 1984, for example, state subsidies for such items reached 17 billion yuan.

The problem of a growing social differentiation among the peasant population arose. Approximately up to 3 percent of the peasants belong to the most prosperous group. Many of them are in industry, own hotels or, in a word, invest their capital in petty production. The Chinese leaders do not see this to be a great problem, hoping gradually, stratum by stratum, to raise the entire peasantry to the level of the prosperous. As Deng Xiaoping emphasizes, poverty is incompatible with socialism.

"The reforms in the countryside carried out in recent years are of revolutionary significance," Deng Xiaoping writes. "We have also engaged in experimentation in the area of urban reform... This means that an atmosphere of global reform will appear in China. The reform in the countryside yielded its initial results 3 years later. In order to be able to see the significant changes which the reform in the city will bring about, between 3 to 5 years will be required." That is what Deng Xiaoping said in 1984 on the subject of the policy of modernization (p 75).

The idea of developing a planned commodity economy was the essential theoretical foundation for reform in industry. The enterprise, which was granted broad rights for independent economic activities, became the focal point of restructuring in industry. The directors of most plants in China sign contracts with suppliers, consistent

with the interests of the enterprise and most of the goods they produce are sold on the market. Now they have been granted significant freedom in terms of wages, and in hiring and firing workers and employees. Some medium-sized and small state enterprises have been leased to their collectives. As a result of such changes the wages of the personnel of 400,000 urban enterprises have become dependent on their profits. A radical change in the price system has been initiated, although inflation and the possibility of its growth have slowed this process down.

The steps which were taken ensured the accelerated development of industry. Thus, compared with 1985, the 1986 gross output was 11.1 percent higher (without any acceleration in the pace). Excluding rural industry, the growth equaled 9.2 percent. Correspondingly, the living standard of the workers improved as well, but less so than that of the peasants. We must bear in mind, however, that in the past the living standard of the rural population was significantly lower compared to the urban.

Another most important element in China's economic reform is increasing cooperation with foreign countries. As Deng Xiaoping writes, "along with the course of reviving the economy within the country, we charted a course of expanding economic relations with foreign countries" (p 76). He emphasizes that the policy of broadening relations with foreign countries followed by China, is directed not only toward the United States and Japan and the other developed countries. One of its important aspects is "south-south" cooperation. "Furthermore, there is yet another aspect: expanding relations with the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries" (p 95).

It is true that relations with the capitalist countries have assumed priority in China's economic relations. In 1986 China's foreign trade totaled \$73.8 billion. Imports of \$42.9 billion exceeded exports and the deficit amounted to \$12 billion. For that reason, China has resorted to major foreign loans, the amounts of which have been increasing. Between 1979 and 1986 the PRC accepted foreign investments totaling \$28.7 billion; 71.4 percent of them were in the nature of loans.

In promoting a policy of extensive cooperation with foreign countries, China decided, above all, to open access to them in 14 maritime cities. Several special economic zones were established where foreign capital and foreign technology are extensively used and joint enterprises have been established. In speaking of China's long-term economic cooperation with other countries, Deng Xiaoping notes that the task is to double China's foreign trade in the immediate future and, by the end of the century, to quadruple it, so that it may total \$200 billion (see p 121).

Recently priority in the reorganization activities of the PRC has been given to the reorganization of the political structure, without which no further intensification of the

economic reforms is possible. "The reform of the economic system," the author claims, "is basically developing successfully in China. However, in the course of its development it will inevitably encounter obstacles. There are those within the party and the country who do not like the reform although its real enemies are few. The crux of the matter is that the political structure is inconsistent with the requirements of the reform of the economic system. That is why without a reorganization of the political structure we cannot ensure the success of the economic reform and its further progress" (p 159).

What is the nature of the political restructuring which was one of the main topics of the 13th CPC Congress? Deng Xiaoping notes that for the time being there is no complete clarity on this matter. Nonetheless, he formulates its three main objectives. The first is to ensure the firm viability of the party and the state, which is related to the rejuvenation of cadres, above all by placing in positions of leadership strong political leaders, economic managers, scientists, literary workers and other specialists in their 30s and 40s. The second is to upgrade the efficiency of the work. This involves the clear demarcation between the functions of party and state authorities, for so far the party has been performing governmental functions. The third objective is to enhance the activeness of the lower strata and to free the initiative of workers, peasants and intellectuals. This, precisely, is the nature of democratization of management.

Practical experience itself has contributed to achieving a real understanding of the tasks pursued in the course of the process of democratization as well as its political limitations. By the end of 1986 a wave of student disturbances broke out in China, although it covered a small number of students (between 1 and 2 percent); nonetheless, the country's leadership drew serious conclusions concerning the development of democracy and the struggle against bourgeois liberalization. As Deng Xiaoping emphasized, these events reflected "the weakness of our leadership." "In the final account, we support the following four basic principles: the socialist way, the democratic dictatorship by the people, communist party leadership, defense of Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of Mao Zedong; we must constantly educate the people in the spirit of these fundamental principles" (p 181).

The development of spiritual culture as well is a major component of the reform in the country. Theoreticians, Deng Xiaoping points out, have done a great deal of scientific research and propaganda work in connection with the question of practice as the only criterion of truth, the scientific summation of party history, particularly since the founding of the PRC, problems of building socialism with a Chinese face, forms of economic and political mechanism, and intensified upbringing in a spirit of communism and patriotism. However, theoretical and artistic circles still face a number of problems. A major confusion has developed and there has been spiritual pollution. How is this expressed? A significant percentage of theoretical workers show no

interest in the most important problems of the practice of socialist modernization. They are interested less in criticizing capitalism than in criticizing socialism. They ascribe to socialism itself the feature of alienation, claiming that under socialism an alienation occurs in the economic, political and ideological areas and that socialism, in the course of its development and by virtue of the activities of the social subject, constantly creates forces of alienation. They explain even the reform in China as an effort to surmount so-called alienation.

In this connection, Deng Xiaoping considers the question of how to react to bourgeois culture of the contemporary West. "We need," he says, "to study the achievements of progressive science and technology in the developed capitalist countries. We must learn from them economic management and, in general, take from them anything which could be useful to us in the areas of knowledge and culture. It would be stupid to shut ourselves within our own shell and to mark time. However, anything pertaining to culture must... be subject to Marxist analysis, evaluation and criticism" (pp 37-38). In connection with the fact that some comrades heap blanket praises on Western philosophical, economic, sociopolitical and artistic trends, Deng Xiaoping has called upon all workers in culture firmly to struggle against spiritual pollution.

The collection includes a number of major statements made by Deng Xiaoping on China's foreign policy and defense. He considers that the army must be subordinated to the interests of the overall project of building socialism in the country. He has suggested that some of the armed forces be used in supporting the development of the national economy (see pp 98-102).

The author frequently turns to the problem of the general and specific features in building socialism. Thus, in a talk with W. Jaruzelski, PZPR Central Committee first secretary, Deng Xiaoping pointed out that "both our countries have taken the path of restructuring. The methods we have formulated for reorganizing the political structure are perhaps quite different from yours. This proves that both you and we proceed on the basis of the conditions prevailing in our own countries.... Nonetheless, we have the same common objective" (p 166). Deng Xiaoping expressed the same thought during his meeting with L. Strougal, head of the Czechoslovak government, adding that "we set ourselves the task of building socialism with a Chinese face and I am confident that you will understand us" (p 185).

In conclusion, let us point out the role which Deng Xiaoping has played in the development of the reform in China. Twice expelled from his positions and twice returning to the leadership of the country, this political leader has had a tremendous impact on the historical turn made by the PRC in adopting a policy of structural reforms and uprooting the consequences of the "cultural revolution."



Deng Xiaoping's book offers an idea of the difficulties and successes in the present development of the PRC. It also proves the tremendous vital strength of socialism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**Chronicle. Meetings With the Editors**

18020006q Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18, Dec 87 (signed to press 7 Dec 87) p 120

[Text] A meeting between *KOMMUNIST* editors and editors of republic, kray, oblast and many city newspapers and personnel working in other mass information media was held at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences. The attention was focused on the problems of reorganization in the work of the press, covering the reform of the economic mechanism and topical problems of party building, and democratization of the spiritual life of society.

A meeting between members of the journal and personnel of the union and republic vocational-technical education committees was held at the USSR Gosprofobr. Problems of restructuring the social sciences were discussed. Pressing problems of improving the teaching of social disciplines in the PTU were considered along with the writing of new textbooks and school aids, retraining teaching cadres and strengthening the conceptual and political training of the young generation.

The faculty of the department of philosophy and students of the acting department of the VGIK met with representatives of the journal. Their discussion concerned the political results of the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution, the resolutions of the October 1987 Central Committee Plenum and the problems of implementing the cultural policy drafted by the 27th CPSU Congress.

*KOMMUNIST* editors were visited by a group of journalists from the PNR. The guests were instructed about the work done by *KOMMUNIST* in covering the course of restructuring and on the topics of discussions sponsored by the journal. Great interest was shown in the discussion of problems related to the CPSU course of democratization and glasnost. The participants in the meeting expressed reciprocal interest in intensifying cooperation and exchanging experience in the participation of journalists in the revolutionary processes of renovation of all areas of life in a socialist society, taking place in the USSR and the People's Republic of Poland.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

05003

**Publication Data**

18020006r Moscow *KOMMUNIST* in Russian No 18, Dec 87

English Title: *KOMMUNIST*, No 18, December 1987

Russian title: *KOMMUNIST*, 18 (1316), Dekabr 1987

Editors: N.B. Bikkenin (editor-in-chief), A.I. Antipov, E.A. Arab-Ogly, B.S. Arkhipov, K.N. Brutents, I.A. Dedkov, V.I. Kadulin, S.V. Kolesnikov, O.R. Latsis, Yu.L. Molchanov, Ye.Z. Razumov, V.F. Rubtsov, N.N. Sibiryakov, Yu.A. Sklyarov, V.P. Trubnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, S.F. Yarmolyuk.

Publishing House: Izdatelstvo "Pravda"

Place of Publication: Moscow

Date of Publication: November 1987

Signed to Press: 7 December 1987

Copies: 1,065,000

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Kommunist", 1987.

END

16

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

## SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.